



A Reconstruction of the *Defence* Based on
Specifications in Mr. Owens' Article.

Drawn for the Magazine by J. Carroll Mansfield

MARYLAND

HISTORICAL MAGAZINE

VOL. XXXVIII

SEPTEMBER, 1943

No. 3

MARYLAND'S FIRST WARSHIP *

By HAMILTON OWENS

Baltimore, although so far from the sea, has had from the very beginning a special concern with and for the Navy. Perhaps it is because we are so many miles from the coast that we cling all the more closely to our salt-water life line and emphasize more strongly than most cities that the sea is our heritage.

In any event, that is our practice. The list of our naval heroes and of the achievement in battle of our ships and men is a long one. Joshua Barney is our most picturesque naval figure. Stephen Decatur, Jr., is ours only by the accident of birth, but one of the ships he commanded was Baltimore built. That was, of course, the lucky little *Enterprise*. The old *Constellation*, in exile at Newport, is our most famous ship. The 30-hour bombardment of Fort McHenry is the best known of our battles, though, of course, we were land-fighting against a sea-borne force in that particular affair.

It occurred to me that, in all our history, there is no better proof of Baltimore's understanding of the need for a Navy and the true function of a naval force—which is to keep open the sea lanes—than is to be found in the tale of the Maryland ship of war *Defence* whose short but useful career began before the sign-

* Address before the Society on "Navy Night," May 10, 1943. The facts cited with reference to the ship *Defence*, commissioned in 1776, have been largely drawn from the MS volume, "Revolutionary Records: The Ship Defence, Dimensions, Equipment and Company. Compiled from Papers in the Land Office of Maryland by Philip D. Laird, 1896." This book is in possession of the Maryland Historical Society. Mr. Owens' remarks have appeared in the Appendix to the *Congressional Record* for May 24, 1943, along with the speeches of Under Secretary of the Navy James V. Forrestal and Rear Admiral W. H. P. Blandy on the same occasion.

ing of the Declaration of Independence. The story is a familiar one to many in this audience but it is such a good yarn and has so many overtones, some of them not without humor, that I am going to risk outlining it once again.

When the Commonwealth of Maryland determined to join in the general resistance to British tyranny, one of its first decisions was to contribute two vessels to the national cause under congressional authorization. They were the sloop *Hornet*, Bermuda built, and the schooner *Wasp*, characteristic product of a Chesapeake yard. Barney, incidentally, got his first naval commission at this time. He was second lieutenant on the *Hornet*.

Both of these vessels went speedily to sea to join the new Continental Fleet under Capt. Esek Hopkins. Baltimore itself was left with no ships of war to patrol the Chesapeake Bay and guard the approaches to the port. This meant, of course, that if the British decided to blockade and cut off the flour and tobacco trade they could do so at no cost to themselves. It also meant that if they decided to attack, they could land forces with impunity and march in the city's back door despite the several defenses set up to guard the harbor.

The town's leading citizens, wiser in matters of naval strategy than one would have thought, saw the situation as soon as the British did and hastily procured from the general assembly at Annapolis the right to commission their own ship of war to sail under the flag of Maryland. By the easy, informal methods of the time it was natural that two of the town's merchants should be appointed agents in the enterprise and given authority to use the State's funds—in bills of course—in payment therefor.

I will not bore you with all the details of the processes by which this first vessel in the Maryland navy was acquired. Because of the danger of the blockade, a number of ships were tied up in the harbor. Among them was a stout vessel, rather larger than the characteristic schooners of the time, which belonged to a merchant named John Smith. She was a full-rigged ship. She was about 85 feet long over-all, and her beam was about 25 feet. She was deep in the stern, like most Chesapeake vessels, and when fully loaded she drew 12½ feet. This means that compared to most of the Baltimore boats she was commodious and able. Mr. Smith, although a patriot, was not averse to setting a good figure on her.

The merchants, acting for the State, of course, agreed to pay him 1,450 pounds sterling as she stood.

The next thing was to find a commander. In those days, as in these, the Eastern Shore produced a special breed of sailors. Among the well-to-do families over there was one with the surname Nicholson, with many sons. The second of these was James Nicholson. He was a bright and engaging youth and his family had sent him to England for an education. While there he decided to make the sea his profession and, as a junior officer in the British navy, he was present at the siege of Havana in 1762. This gave him a reputation throughout the colony as a man experienced in naval affairs. He was something of a politician too, and it was not surprising that he was chosen to command the new warship. He gave her the name *Defence* and set himself immediately to the task of fitting her out in accordance with the prestige of a soon-to-be sovereign State. He was given a stipend of 500 pounds sterling that he might live according to his station while the work was in progress.

When the ship was brought she had a complete set of sails, but Messrs. Lux and Bowley, who were her agents, and who probably chose Mr. Nicholson as commander, thought it well to see that she had a whole new outfit. Mr. Lux was a merchant and a rope-maker, one of the most important in the community. Lux is Latin for light and Light Street is named after him. Mr. Bowley was his father-in-law, also a merchant. He had built one of the town's chief wharfs, which is still called after him.

The order for the canvas for the new sails was given to the firm of S. & R. Purviance, a name which has long been noteworthy in the history of Baltimore. They provided 2,379 yards of sail cloth, for which the State paid something over 285 pounds sterling. New sails implied new rigging. Most of this was made in Mr. Lux's rope-walk on the edge of town. There were more than 11 tons of it and it cost 740 pounds sterling. The anchor and part of the cable were supplied by Mr. H. Young, for £105. Pig iron weighing 42½ tons was needed for ballast. It cost £371. One of the men interested in the smelting of pig iron at that time was Charles Carroll of Carrollton. It is probable that his company supplied at least part of this necessary ballast.

Above everything else, there was the question of guns and muni-

tions. Captain Nicholson worked hard on this. On this little vessel he found space to mount 18 six-pounders on the main deck and 4 more of them on the quarter deck. Britchens and tackle as well as carriages had to be fashioned. The local foundries cast 1,600 round shot and 100 grape, each containing 10 9-ounce balls, the equivalent, perhaps, of modern shrapnel. There were 72 double-headed shot, useful to cut the rigging of an opponent.

One could go on with this sort of compilation. There were powder by the ton, hand grenades, boarding pikes, cutlasses, muskets, handspikes, and all the paraphernalia for the close fighting which was the practice in naval warfare at the time. There were navigation instruments, hourglasses, lead lines, speaking trumpets. There were ships' boats and captain's barges, all handsomely equipped. There were supplies of food—beef, cheese, potatoes, bread, and flour. Bedding for the crew cost £672.

One can imagine the boom along the water-front as the merchants rushed in to bid for the right to supply the ship. One can imagine the carts hauling the supplies to the dockside, the craftsmen swarming over the ship trying to work amidst the confusion, the carpenters, joiners, and riggers applying for jobs and getting them perhaps at higher wages than they had ever received before. Nearly £2,000 was paid out for days' work actually done on the ship. One can imagine the haughty, handsome figure of Captain Nicholson standing on the quarter-deck watching the orderly confusion of the scene below him and imagining himself, probably, as the presiding genius not only in the fitting of the ship, but in the heroic battles she was soon to fight if all went well.

Today we talk a lot about the present war boom and what it has done for and to Baltimore. But I imagine that the excitements, the dislocations, the alarums and excursions along the Baltimore water-front today are not one bit more tremendous, taking scale into consideration, than were the excitements and dislocations which attended the purchase and outfitting of the first Baltimore warship, *Defence*.

You will have noticed that nearly every merchant in the town participated in the business of supplying her and that they got good prices for what they had to sell. You may be tempted to call them profiteers. But before using that word, one ought to remember that this was a time of rapidly rising prices; the mer-

chants, cut off by the non-importation agreements from England, which was the usual source of almost all manufactured goods, had to improvise a defense industry. There was no Reconstruction Finance Corporation to finance them. They had to use their own capital. They foresaw a long war and perhaps declining trade. They didn't yet know how well they would be able to do in the business of privateering. They weren't even sure that the State would reimburse them for their outlays. What they knew was that they needed a navy and needed it quickly. They were determined to supply it regardless of cost. They got good prices on paper for what they supplied the *Defence*. Some of them made fortunes during the war—though they didn't know it until long afterwards. Some of them went bankrupt. But they outfitted the ship. The total cost, including the hull, was 11,272 pounds, 18 shillings and 6 pence, or something more than \$10 apiece for every man, woman and child in the community.

The *Defence* did not see much in the way of action. Few naval vessels do. They watch, they patrol. They are kept in a state of eternal preparedness. Sometimes they are called upon to act before they are ready. That is what happened to the *Defence*. She was lying at her pier, her decks still cluttered with her multifarious gear, when word came to Baltimore that a new British war vessel was proceeding up the bay to attack the city. This turned out to be H. M. S. *Otter*, a sloop-of-war of considerable power. The commander of the *Otter*, Captain Squire, had heard of the *Defence* and his job was to put her out of business. He had heard, also, that several schooners, loaded with flour, were about to sail from Baltimore and, since the British fleet needed flour, he thought he would at one and the same time capture the *Defence* and supply the fleet with the needed bread. He announced to a messenger sent aboard that he was willing to pay for the flour but that he was determined to capture the *Defence*, which he called a privateer. This message he gave out overnight, while he was anchored just north of what we now call Gibson Island.

Next morning, Captain Squire sent a tender, which had accompanied him, into the Patapsco River to take a schooner anchored there, loaded with flour and ready to depart for the West Indies. But the news had by this time reached Baltimore. Captain Nicholson, with an alacrity which he did not always dis-

play, got his crew aboard, made sail and proceeded down the river. The men on the tender saw him coming, abandoned their prize, and ran toward the protection of the *Otter*. The captain of the latter weighed anchor and prepared for battle. But at this point he fell into difficulty for, not knowing the channel, he struck on a shoal—either Bodkin Point or Seven Foot Knoll—and heeled over considerably, according to the account of a man who happened to be aboard. If the *Defence* had attacked him immediately, he would probably have been destroyed. But each vessel was a little fearful of the strength of the other. They did not come to an actual meeting and finally, as night fell, Nicholson put the *Defence* about and returned to Baltimore. The *Otter* likewise decided it was better not to come to grips and came about on the rising tide and stood down the bay.

This may seem to us to have been an inconclusive affair but actually, it shows a navy doing precisely what it is supposed to do. During this meeting, in which not a shot was fired, several things happened. The first one, of course, was the recapture of the flour-laden schooner which the British tender had taken. The second was the display of strength by the *Defence*. This display served to convince the commander of the *Otter* that he had better keep his distance from Baltimore. But keeping a distance from Baltimore meant that the near approaches to the city were free, for quite a long time, from hostile forces, and that the flour-laden ships could come and go. When the Marylanders were able to add to the *Defence* and provide not one vessel merely, but a whole fleet, it meant that they could keep the bay almost completely free of British vessels.

During all save one or two of the long years of the Revolution, Baltimore maintained her trade with remarkably little interference. She had learned the value of a naval force. Later on, most of the burden was taken over, in form at least, by the new Federal Government. Baltimore, then as now, was one of the chief shipbuilding centers of the country. And I like to think that, just as the merchants of Revolutionary days knew instinctively the value of a navy, so we, their descendants, know and appreciate the Navy in precisely the same way. They couldn't survive without it and we couldn't either.

CIVIL WAR SONG SHEETS

ONE OF THE COLLECTIONS OF THE MARYLAND HISTORICAL SOCIETY

By RAPHAEL SEMMES

Because they exhibit the popular feeling of the times song sheets are a part of the history of any war. They should be considered in any estimate of the temper of a people. They express public sentiment and are an index of the sincerity of a nation at the time they are written. Many of the Civil War song sheets do not have poetic merit. Written at a time when public feeling was aroused some of the verses appear harsh and vindictive. The fact, however, that thousands of people read or sang them warrants their collection and preservation. Not only are they a form of emotional literature, but their historical value must also be admitted. At this time, when we are engaged in another war, it is interesting to look back almost one hundred years to these song sheets of the Civil War.

If the number of song sheets in the Society's collection, which express a wish that Maryland should side with the Confederacy, is any indication of the popular feeling at the time, there is little doubt that the majority of people in Baltimore, at least, favored the South. This was due to the fact that many of the people in the city had had close social and business associations in the past with Southerners. For this reason they resented any force being applied to the seceding states and they objected particularly to the presence of Union troops in the city and state.

The state's song, "Maryland, My Maryland," is an expression of this very sentiment. James Ryder Randall, who was a native of Maryland, was led to write the words of this stirring song when, in Louisiana, he heard of the attack on Massachusetts troops as they passed through Baltimore on April 19, 1861.

The Society has two copies of "Maryland, My Maryland." In one of them "My Normandy," which was then a popular French air, is given as the tune to accompany the words. Henry C. Wagner, of Baltimore, adapted the words to this tune. It was not until later that the verses were sung to "Tannenbaum, O Tannen-

baum," a German song, and it was through the medium of this tune and not the French air that "Maryland, My Maryland" attained its popularity and fame. This is interesting in view of the fact that most of the people in Maryland of German extraction were in favor of Maryland remaining in the Union.

The other copy of "Maryland, My Maryland," in the Society's collection, is one which was read by Randall himself at the reunion of the Society of the Army and Navy of the Confederate States at the Eutaw House, in Baltimore, on February 22nd, 1881.

There are two other Civil War songs of which Randall was the author and of which the Society has copies. One is entitled "The Battle Cry of the South," a spirited song some of the lines of which read:

To arms! to arms! for the South needs help
And a craven is he who flees. . . .

The other war song is dedicated to Stonewall Jackson. Although Randall wrote many other songs which were Southern in sympathy, the Society has copies of only these two.¹

Many of the song sheets which express a wish that Maryland should join with the seceding states were printed in Baltimore. As Maryland was under the control of Union troops, naturally the name of the publisher never appears and the name of the author rarely appears although sometimes he signs the initials of his name. With two exceptions all the song sheets were printed in Baltimore in the year 1862. One of the verses published earlier, or in 1861, was entitled "Are We Free?" In this the author laments that Maryland under the Federalists is no longer free. The other song printed in Baltimore in 1861 is entitled "The Debt of Maryland." The writer, who signs "H," feels that Marylanders have a debt to repay for having harbored so many pro-Unionists.

All of the song sheets printed in Baltimore in 1862 express in different ways the hope that Maryland would side with the Confederacy. In verses entitled "There's Life in the Old Land Yet," the author, who signs his initials "J. B.," hopes that Maryland will be freed from Union oppression:

¹ Poems of which Randall was the author can be found in *Maryland, My Maryland and Other Poems*, by James Ryder Randall (Baltimore, 1908); *The Poems of James Ryder Randall*, edited by Matthew Page Andrews (New York, 1910).

Oh! Maryland mother of Justice, and Right,
 Shake off the base fetters, which bind thee so tight!
 Come forth in thy power, and settle thy debt,
 For we KNOW that there is life in old Maryland yet! ²

"The Call!" written in October, 1862, appeals to Marylanders and to Baltimoreans in particular to side with the South:

Baltimore! Baltimore!
 City of beauty,
 Daring as heretofore
 Spring to thy duty.
 Spurn the invader forth,
 Tell the usurping North,
 That when two hearts are wroth,
 Union must sever!

The Society has two song sheets with exactly the same verses but different titles and written by a man who signs "A Rebel." "God will Repay" is the title of one, and "Right must Prevail" is the caption of the other. The "rebel" regrets that Maryland under Union troops is held "in base subjection."

In some of the song sheets, printed in Baltimore during 1862, the wish is expressed that the South will come to Maryland's aid and drive the Union troops out of the state. Such is the subject of "Down Trodden Maryland," "Da Vis" (Davis), and "The Virginia's Knocking Around." The author of the first of these songs, who signs "N. G. R." his initials, appeals to the South to help Maryland:

Down-trodden, despised see brave Maryland lie,
 The noblest of all States. . . .³

² There are three song sheets each having the same title, that is, "There's Life in the Old Land Yet," but each of which has different verses. The one of which "J. B." is the author is quoted from in the text. Another is attributed to Francis Key Howard, while the third one was written by James Ryder Randall in 1861. There is still another song sheet with a similar title, that is, "There's Life in Old Maryland Yet," which also has a different set of verses. It was written by a man who signed "Cola." This and the song attributed to Howard were both printed in 1862. The Society has copies of all these song sheets with the exception of the one written by Randall.

It would be interesting to know the real name of the man who signed "Cola," as well as the names of the authors who signed only their initials, as, for example, who was "H" and "J. B." and many others who, as we shall see, followed the same practice.

³ This copy of "Down Trodden Maryland" was published on March 4, 1862. The Society has another copy with the same title, which was signed by "B," and which was to be sung to the tune of "Tom Bowling." This was printed in Baltimore on November 18, 1861. It has only three verses instead of six. "N. G. R." may be the initials of Dr. Nicholas G. Ridgely.

"Quien Sabe," who wrote "Da Vis," hopes that Maryland will be freed from the northern yoke, while the author of "The Virginia's Knocking Around," predicts the capture of Washington by Southern troops:

With God on their side they'll come to the aid
Of Old Maryland chained tho' she be and betrayed. . . .

In another Baltimore imprint of 1862 entitled "An Appeal for Maryland," the writer, who signs as "B," makes a fervent appeal to the South to save Maryland from Union domination:

Who did the ungrateful South now leave,
Beneath oppression's chain to grieve;
When she had helped them with her might?
'Tis Maryland! ⁴

There are in the collection some song sheets, printed outside of Maryland, which express sentiments similar to those just discussed. In "Hark! O'er the Southern Hills," written by "A Southern Lady," she writes:

O, Maryland, dread not, the hours
Shall come to make thee high as brave,
When Dixie humbles Northern powers,
And claims the soil those powers enslave.⁵

In a similar vein is "The Exiled Soldier's Adieu to Maryland," written at a camp near Manassas on July 5, 1861. In these verses, which were to be sung to the tune of "Bertrand's Adieu to France," the author says that although the Northern "tyrants" have driven him out of his state he promises that—

My sword shall not ingloriously rust!
Exiled, I swear to die, or set thee free.

⁴Three other song sheets, printed in Baltimore in 1862, remain to be considered. One of them is entitled "Our Opinion; a Hit at these Times," of which the author was "Le Diable Baiteux." The hits include Baltimoreans who "doubt all, and then wisely scout all." Another song sheet has the title "All Spice; or, Spice for All," and is signed by "Cola." This song has only the first three verses of "Our Opinion; a Hit at these Times." The third item is dedicated "To Sauerwein" and was to be sung to the tune of "My Maryland." Written by a member of the Baltimore Corn Exchange, it contains a criticism of the men in this exchange who were hostile to the South.

⁵These verses were printed in Norfolk, Virginia, in 1862. The same verses were also printed in Baltimore in 1862, but with the verse about Maryland and also one other verse omitted. The title of the Baltimore imprint is: "An Appeal to the South," by "A Daughter of Dixie," who also signed "H."

In Richmond, Virginia, during the same year Mrs. D. K. Whitaker, of South Carolina, wrote verses entitled "Maryland in Chains," in which the Southern woman expresses pity for Maryland:

Astonished the nations behold thy disgrace,
While robbed and oppressed by a vile Northern race.

Many song sheets were published which have on them no date or place of publication. Some of these refer to the plight of Maryland under Union control. There is one, for example, entitled "Baltimore" in which the author laments the fact that the city is "by Northern vandals crushed." There is also the "Song of the Baltimore Rebels," written to the tune of "Wait for the Wagon," in which Baltimoreans are urged to join the Confederate army and drive the Union troops out of the town. Similarly, in a song sheet bearing the caption "Maryland in Fetters!" the people of the state are asked to—

Break! break! the traitor's chain,
Oh! God of heaven;
And from our down trod land
Let them be driven! ⁶

In the Society's collection there are three song sheets which deal with Maryland's "Old Line." One of them was printed in Baltimore in 1861 and is entitled "A Voice from the Old Maryland Line." It was to be sung to the tune of "Maryland, My Maryland." This was written, according to the statement on the song sheet, under the influence of the excitement prevalent in Baltimore when the report was received that the Confederates had crossed the Potomac at Port Tobacco, and cut Gen. Sickles' brigade to pieces. The opening lines are as follows:

⁶ In "The Marylander's Good Bye," sung to the tune of "The White Rose," the author in bidding good bye to his state says that he is ready for "freedom's sacred cause to stand, to conquer or to fall." In another song sheet entitled "Maryland. A Fragment," hope is expressed that Maryland will take her stand with the Confederacy.

In a similar vein are the following: "An Impromptu," by Dr. Barnstable, B. C. H. G.; "Yankee Vandals" to the tune of "Gay and Happy" and a song sheet entitled "Sunny South." In "The Flag" written by "A Lady of South Carolina," the author claims that the South no longer owes allegiance to the Stars and Stripes, and that Maryland in the past had done much to add glory to its folds. The writer of "The Tyrant's Cap" wishes that Maryland would be free of Union domination, while the author of "The Southern Wagon," which was written to the tune of "Wait for the Wagon," urges all the Southern states to get aboard the wagon and mentions Maryland and Kentucky as not being able to make up their minds to secede.

The Old Line's foot is on thy shore,
 Maryland, dear Maryland!
 Returned triumphant as of yore;
 Maryland, dear Maryland!

Two other songs refer to the "Old Line." One bears the title of "The Battle Song of the Maryland Line." In this the author urges Marylanders to support the South:

To arms! to arms! Old Maryland!
 High sounds the battle call . . .
 March forward, one and all!

The second song sheet was probably written at Richmond, Virginia, in 1861. It is entitled "Song of the 'Maryland Line' at Richmond," by "Big Sergeant." It was to be sung to the air of "Carry Me Back to Old Virginy." In these verses the author relates how:

We've left our homes in Maryland,
 Our friends in Baltimore,
 To take up arms for the gallant South,
 On Old Virginia's shore. . . .⁷

There are several songs which show the resentment felt by Baltimoreans at the presence of Union troops in the city. One of these was printed in Baltimore on September 11, 1861, and bears the title of "Dix's Manifesto." It was to be sung to the tune of "Dearest Mae." The writer makes fun of General John A. Dix's order that the Confederate colors of red and white could not be displayed in Baltimore:

On Barber's poles, and mint stick,
 He did his veto place;
 He swore that in his city,
 He'd 'Red and White' erase!⁸

⁷ There are two items, on which no date or place of publication appears, which also refer to Maryland troops. One is entitled "Maryland Zouaves Own," and was dedicated to the First Regiment Maryland Zouaves by their friend, G. W. Alexander, Adj't Regm't. In verses which are set to "Dixie," Marylanders are asked to help "a righteous cause." The other song sheet referring to Maryland troops is entitled "Smallwood Infantry Song." It was written by "P. P." and set to the tune of "Root Hog or Die." In this song a company of soldiers of Westminster, Maryland, warns John Brown and the Black Republicans that they had better not come to Carroll county.

⁸ There is a broadside that gives what pretends to be a copy of the order of General Dix in which he directs the suppression of everything red and white in color. There is another song sheet entitled "The Gallant Colonel," in which Colonel Smith, a Federal officer, is criticized for having arrested small boys in

SONG.



MARYLAND IN FETTERS!

How beautiful in tears!
Dear noble State;
Encumbered round with cares,
Thy grief, how great.
The spoiler's foot upon thee,
His ruthless hand is on thee,
With manacles he's bound thee,
Hard is thy fate!

Mother of wretchedness
I feel for thee!
Bow'd down in deep distress,
I kneel to thee!
I see thy wretched woes,
Thy agonizing throes,
And sympathize with those
Who'd set thee free!

Thy tears are those of blood,
Sweet mother dear!
An accumulated flood
Of wrongs severe!
Thy honor's trampled under,
Thy peace is rent asunder,
God of the rattling thunder,
Oh! lend an ear.

Break! break! the traitor's chain,
Oh! God of heaven;
And from our down trod land
Let them be driven!
Let Lincoln know his place,
Let black men know their face,
And from our injured race
All wrongs be riven!

Typical Song Sheet Issued by Confederate Sympathizers

From the Society's Collection

In the collection there is a song sheet entitled "Mayor Brown," which was to be sung to the air of "Rosseau's Dream." This praises George William Brown, then Mayor of Baltimore, for his handling of the clash that occurred in April 19, 1861, between Massachusetts troops and citizens of Baltimore. The Unionists are warned that Jeff Davis will come and—

Then you puss-gut bolly-woppers,
Mischief makers through the town,
You'll be put in mahogany garments,
That is, when your done up *brown*.

Two songs, with no date or place of publication given, but which were both probably printed in Baltimore, deal with the arrest and imprisonment by the Federalists of George P. Kane, then Marshal of Police. One of these is entitled "Marshal Kane," and was to be sung to the same tune as the one about Mayor Brown. These verses praise Kane who had been locked up in Fort McHenry. The other has the title of "Oh Jeff! Why don't you Come?" and was set to the air of "Willie we have missed you." The writer expresses a hope that President Jefferson Davis will come to Baltimore as the Federal troops had disbanded the police and arrested Marshal Kane.

"John Merryman" is the title of another song sheet. He, too, had been imprisoned at Fort McHenry by military order. When a writ of habeas corpus was issued by Chief Justice Roger Brooke Taney, the officer in command of the fort would not comply with it on the ground that he had been ordered by President Lincoln to suspend the writ. Taney then wrote his celebrated opinion (*ex parte John Merryman*) holding that the writ could not be suspended constitutionally by the President, but only by Congress. A tribute to the Justice for his fearless decision is contained in a song dedicated to "Chief Justice Taney." This was to be sung to the air of "The Days of Absence," while "John Merryman" was set to the tune of "Old Dan Tucker." All of those citizens of Maryland who had been placed in jail by the Federalists were the subject of "The Maryland Martyrs"—

Because they boldly dared to tell
The people what was right. . . .

Baltimore for treason. As will be later pointed out in the text, other song sheets criticized Generals Butler and Schenck, who also at different times were in command of Union troops in Baltimore.

While not referring to Maryland's part in the Civil War, there are a number of song sheets in the Society's collection, printed in Baltimore, which praise the Southern cause. Some of them were published in 1861, others in 1862. Among those printed in 1861 was "Chivalrous C. S. A." sung to the air of "Vive la Compagnie." Some of the lines read:

Chivalrous, chivalrous people are they
In C. S. A! In C. S. A!
Aye in chivalrous C. S. A!

"Attention," written by "B," is the title of six verses in praise of the Confederacy. "B" was also the author of two other song sheets. One of them entitled "Southern Sentiments" was to be sung to the tune of "Let Haughty Gaul Invasion Threat." The writer says that the South is not alarmed by the thought of an invasion by Northern troops. "Hark! The Summons" was the title of the other song of which "B" was the author. This was an appeal to the South to resist the "Northern scum."

A number of song sheets praising the South were printed in Baltimore in 1862. Among these was one called "Southron to Arms," sung to the tune of "God Save the South." The author urged Southerners "to die for the right."⁹

The Society has a copy of "Hurrah for Dixie," the words of which were written by Albert Pike. The original verses for "Dixie" were composed by Daniel D. Emmett who sang it for

⁹ "Cotton is King" is the subject of another Baltimore imprint. It was written by "N. G. R." who emphasizes the importance of cotton as an economic weapon in the Civil War. In a similar vein is a song sheet published in Memphis, Tennessee, in May, 1862, entitled "Burn the Cotton!" By burning all the cotton, the author thinks that the Southern cause will be helped. Another song sheet printed in Baltimore was entitled "Southern War Song." In this Southerners are urged to resist the North.

In the Society's collection there are a number of song sheets favorable to the South which were printed in some Southern state. Two of them were printed in Winchester, Virginia. One of them bears the title of "Battle Song of the Black Horseman." This was the war song of the Confederates from the southwest and it was to be sung to the tune of "Dixie." In this song the Southwesterners promise to drive "old Abe with all his band beyond the bounds of Maryland!" The other song sheet printed in Winchester, Virginia, is entitled "Awake in Dixie," which was also to be sung to "Dixie." The author of these verses, who signs "H. J. S." appeals to the South to fight the North. "The Song of the Exile," written by "B," was printed in Martinsburg, Virginia, in 1861. These were nine verses in praise of the Southern cause. It, too, was to be sung to the tune of "Dixie." In Savannah, Georgia, there were published in the year 1863 verses entitled "Graves for the Invaders. A Fragment." In this the author hopes to bury the Northerners deep in the Southern soil which they have invaded.

the first time in 1859. Pike wrote the words for "Dixie" in 1861 but Emmett's words are the ones which have survived. Unfortunately the Society does not have a copy of Emmett's version.¹⁰

Many of the song sheets, which have no place or date of publication, refer to the Confederate flag. Three of them were to be sung to the tune of "The Star Spangled Banner." One of them entitled "The Flag of Secession," making use of this anthem, changed the words to read:

And the Flag of Secession in triumph shall wave,
O'er the land of the freed and the home of the brave.

Similarly, "The Stars and Bars" and "The Southern Cross" were sung to the tune of "The Star Spangled Banner."¹¹

Some Southern songs invoked God's aid to help the South. One of these, "God and Liberty!" has the following stirring appeal:

In the name of God! Amen!
Stand for our Southern rights;
On your side Southern men,
The God of battles fights!

"God save the South" contains a plea to God to help the South, as does "God Bless the South," sung to the tune of "God Speed the Right."¹²

There are also song sheets which call on the men of the South to resist the North. Such, for example, is the subject of "Country, Home and Liberty," in which the writer begs Southerners to defend their independence:

Freedom calls! ye brave!
Rise, and spurn the name of slave.

In a similar vein is the "Southern Song of Liberty," and "The Spirit of 1861," which has the following opening lines:

¹⁰ "Good News from Dixie" also appears to have the words of "Dixie" as written by Albert Pike.

¹¹ The following song sheets either glorify the Confederate flag or refer in slighting terms to the Stars and Stripes: "Our Rights"; "Southern Red, White and Blue"; "Long May it Wave!"; "Rally Round the Standard Boys"; "Hail! To the South"; and "The Southern War Song," sung to the tune of "I'm Afloat." In "The Confederate States" the author claims that no nation can boast "such a man—such a toast—the Confederate States and its President forever."

¹² "The South and North" and "Our Hope," written by a man who signed "Le Diable Baiteux," also ask God's aid for the South.

Arise, Confederates! hear your country's call!
The hour is come,—the hour to do or die. . . .¹³

The author of "The American Rebels" takes pride in being called a rebel:

Then call us rebels if you will,
We'll glory in the name,
For, bending under unjust laws,
And swearing faith to an unjust cause,
We count a greater shame.

"Recognition of the Southern Confederacy," sung to the tune of "Rosseau's Dream," urges Lincoln to recognize the South. "Recognize us now or die," the author warns the President.¹⁴

In the "Ode on the Meeting of the Southern Congress," Henry Timrod, the author, rejoices that the Confederacy is at last "a nation among nations." These verses were written on the occasion of the meeting of the Confederate Congress at Montgomery on February 4, 1861. Of interest to Marylanders is a song sheet with the caption "The Dying Confederate's Last Words." The author, who signed "Maryland," writes that he is certain that after sacrificing his life for the South:

The angels sweetly stand and beckon me to come,
To that bright land of bliss that heavenly realm my home.¹⁵

¹³ In "The Southrons are Coming," sung to the air of "The Camels [*sic*] are Coming," the author warns the North that the "Southrons are coming, heigho! heigho!" Two song sheets contain warnings to Northern soldiers. In one of these, entitled "Little Sogers," Northerners, who are given this appellation, are advised that they had better go home and not fight the South. Another warning to Yankee soldiers to keep out of Virginia and the South is contained in "Them Saucy Masked Batteries," which was sung to the tune of "Bobbin Around."

¹⁴ In "Peace" sung to the air of "The American Boy," the author claims that the South only wants to be let alone. In another song sheet entitled "The South," the writer hopes that the South will be the scene of a glorious victory and not of "Freedom's grave." In a similar vein was "Land of the South!" sung to the tune of "Happy Land."

¹⁵ In the Society's collection there are a number of song sheets which stress the part played in the Civil War by some of the Southern states. "The Alabama Cottage" pictures life in an Alabama home while the mehfolk are away fighting for the South. In "The Georgia Volunteer," published at Savannah, Georgia, the author says that he answers the call of the South to resist oppression by the North. "Kentuckians to Arms!" a Louisville imprint (1861), urges the Kentuckians to drive the Northerners out of the state. In Charleston, S. C., was printed in 1861 "South Carolina, a Patriotic Ode." This was to be sung to the tune of "My Country 'Tis of Thee." The "Texan Rangers," published in Galveston in 1861, extols the part played by these rangers in fighting the Yankees, while "John Bell of Tennessee," sung to the tune of "Auld Lang Syne," was in praise of this noted man.

In a far different vein is "A Song for Dogs!" written in 1864 when the prospects of a victory for the South seemed less bright. These verses lament the fact that the present generation of Southerners were not worthy sons of their fathers and that they had lost the freedom their ancestors had won.

Song sheets were written to commemorate victories of the Confederate army. Some of them were printed in Baltimore, such as "The Retreat of the Grand Army from Bull Run," which celebrated this battle. This was written by Ernest Clifton to be sung to "Sweet Evelina."¹⁶

Another Baltimore imprint (1861) was entitled "Our Left. Dedicated to the Maryland hero, Gen. Arnold Elzey, C. S. A." In these verses the general and his Maryland troops are praised for their bravery in the Battle of Manassas. Also relating to this battle is a song sheet bearing the title "My God! What is all this for?" These words, the author states, were the dying words of a Union soldier on the battlefield of Manassas in 1861. The writer gives the answer:

'Twas to tread on Southern honour,
And to rob the South of gold!¹⁷

Two song sheets commemorate the fall of Fort Sumter. One is entitled "Fort Sumter. A Southern Song," and it was to be sung to the tune of "Dearest May." On the same subject is "Southern Yankee Doodle," to the air of "Yankee Doodle," which pokes fun at Major Anderson's defence of this fort.

Some songs sang the praises of Southern generals. One of these printed in Baltimore in April, 1869, four years after the Civil War, is entitled "The Confederate Marylander's Welcome to

¹⁶ Other songs celebrating the same battle were "Battle at Bulls Run"; "Bull Run," sung to the tune of "Wait for the Wagon"; and "The Retreat of the Sixty Thousand Lincoln Troops."

Two song sheets commemorate the battle of Big Bethel when Colonel J. B. Magruder, C. S. A., won a victory over Gen. Ebenezer W. Peirce. One is entitled "The Battle of Big Bethel" and the other "Great Big Bethel Fight," which was to be sung to the tune of "Dixie." "Munson's Hill," sung to the air of "Call Me Pet names," makes fun of the Yankees for having been fooled by the Southerners in this battle.

¹⁷ "The Marylander at Manassas. A Fact," signed by "N. G. R." and published in Baltimore in 1861, also commemorates the part played by Maryland men in this battle. Also written in celebration of the same battle is a Richmond, Virginia, imprint (1861) entitled "The Battle of Manassas," by Susan Archer Talley. In these verses mention is made of "Elzey to the rescue." Another song sheet about this battle is "The Exodus." Mention is also made in this of Gen. Elzey.

General Robert E. Lee." This was written by Thomas F. Roche who paid a tribute to the general in these touching words:

God bless thee, noble General!
God bless thee, Robert Lee!
Our Southern hearts throb warmly now,—
Once more we dream we're free. . . .

Another song sheet entitled "General Lee," which is undated and no place of publication given, has these lines for the chorus:

Oh! take me back to old Virginny,
My soldier for to see,
To take him by his gallant hand,
The brave old General Lee.

This was to be sung to the tune of "Oh! Carry me back to old Virginny."

Praise for General Stonewall Jackson is found in several song sheets. The author of one of them, who signs "A Rebel," eulogizes Jackson under the title "Jackson is Dead!" This was published in Baltimore in May, 1863. During the fall of 1862 verses were printed at Martinsburg, Virginia, entitled "Stonewall Jackson's Way." They had been found on a soldier of Jackson's brigade. James Ryder Randall was the author of "Stonewall Jackson, A Sentinel." In these verses Randall writes that even after his death the spirit of Jackson keeps guard over sleeping soldiers:

The Soul of Jackson stalks abroad,
And guards the camp at night.¹⁸

There is also one song sheet entitled "General Jeff Davis," which was sung to the tune of "Kelvin Grove." This speaks of the President of the Confederacy as a "Second Washington," and adds that—

He's burst the chain, the captive's freed,
Southern heartys, oh!

While most of the songs praise Southern generals or celebrate victories of the Confederate army, there are two in the collection which extol exploits of the Confederate navy. One of them applauds Captain George Nicholas Hollins, a native of Maryland,

¹⁸ Praise is given to "General Beauregard" in three song sheets bearing that title. One honors "General Johnston" (Joseph E. Johnston); another "Ben McCullough," while "The Rebel's Retort," sung to the tune of "Cocachelunk," makes fun of Northern generals in comparison with Southern ones.

for sinking the ship *Preble* on the Mississippi River and for driving two other Union vessels ashore. The song sheet is entitled "The Saucy Little Turtle," and was written to the tune of "Coming Through the Rye." The author wishes:

Success to brave old Captain Hollins,
Whose Turtle fought so well,
This brave exploit by Maryland's son,
All history will tell.

Another song sheet, which was printed in Baltimore on October 10th, 1861, praises the cruise of the *Sumter*, which was in command of Raphael Semmes, another son of Maryland. It is entitled "Song of the Privateer," and was written by a man who signs himself "Quien Sabe." The author writes:

Away o'er the boundless sea,
With steady hearts and free,
We man the *Sumter*, we;
Who for the South and liberty,
Are ready all to die!

It was not all praise for the Confederate navy, however, as there is one song which is critical of it. It bears the title "Ye Stationary Navy. A Sarcasm," and was written by "J. S. H." at Mobile, Alabama. The author pokes fun at the sailor boys in Mobile who, "tho' they should be on the sea, are always on the land."

There are a number of song sheets in the Society's collection which make fun of or otherwise criticize prominent officials of the North including Lincoln. Criticism of the President is found in verses entitled "The Last Race of the Rail-Splitter," which ridicules him for avoiding Baltimore after his election because, it is said, he feared trouble there. In another song, "Lincoln on a Rail," sung to the tune of "Sitting on a Rail," the author advocates riding the President on a rail:

Let's take him by the pantaloons,
And turn him up like an old gray coon,
And chuck him high like a musharoon,
Upon a wooden rail,
Ride Lincoln on a rail. . . .¹⁹

¹⁹ A song sheet entitled "Old Abe Lincoln" also makes fun of the President for fearing an outburst of popular feeling in Baltimore; "Uncle Abe, or a Hit at the Times," sung to the air of "Villikins and his Dinah," ridicules Lincoln's career; "There's Nobody Hurt!!" contains satire aimed at the President who, it was said,

A Baltimore imprint (March 15, 1862) having the caption "I Carry Along the Despot's Song," was written by a man who signed "Old Secesh." In these verses the author warned Lincoln that he would have to submit to the South. Two song sheets, without date or place of publication, predict that Jeff Davis will drive Lincoln from Washington. "Old Abe's Lament," sung to the tune of "The Campbells are Coming," contains this prophecy, while "Jeff Davis in the White House," set to the air of "Ye Parliaments of Old England," predicts that Davis will force Lincoln to leave the White House.

Criticism of Lincoln's advisers is contained in verses which were published in Baltimore on July 2nd, 1861, entitled "Great Cry but Little Wool; or, the leading Black Republicans." These were written by a man who signed "Barnstable." He criticizes Chase, Cameron, Wells, Seward, Winfield Scott and Blair, whom the author calls a "degenerate son of Maryland."²⁰

Thomas Holliday Hicks, the Governor of Maryland at the time of the outbreak of the Civil War, who used his influence to prevent Maryland from seceding from the Union, is the subject of criticism in several verses. One of them is entitled "Hicksie." Two song sheets, each having a Latin title, also complain of the Governor's action. In one of them entitled "Audax omnia perpeti Gens Lincolnæ ruit per vetitum nefas," the author, who signs "B," ridicules McDowell, Schenck, Daniel Tyler, General Siegel and Dix, "the colleague of that traitor Hicks." The other has the title "The Federal Vendue. Abraham Auctionarius Loquitur." This makes fun of the policy of the Federalists; how they bought the state of Maryland from "Hicks & Co," and claims that the deeds of sale were drawn up by Henry Winter Davis.

A song sheet entitled "William Price," set to the tune of "John

repeated these words; in "Disgrace & Shame," sung to the air of "The Campbells Are Coming," the author laments the fact that Northerners let themselves be made fools of by Lincoln. Different than most verses is one entitled "A Prayer to be said by All Good Citizens on the day of Fasting and Prayer ordered by Abraham Lincoln." What appears to be a prayer in favor of the Union is really one in which the South asks protection against the North. This is borne out by the fact that each of the lines in the prayer begin with one of the letters in Jefferson Davis' name.

²⁰ "Sic Semper," by a Virginian, criticizes Lincoln, Chase, Cameron, Wells, Seward and others. One song sheet is entitled "Congressman Ely," sung to the tune of "Hi Ho Dobbin." This refers to the capture of Ely, who represented New York in Congress, and his being taken prisoner to Richmond where he was so well treated that he is made to say that the North should make peace with the South.

Todd," is an attack by a sympathizer with the South on Price, member of the Maryland Senate, who was the sponsor of the Treason Bill.

Some of the Union generals were also the subject of critical verses. In Baltimore, on October 14, 1861, was published "The Bold Engineer," set to the tune of "Young Lockinvar." The author, who signs "O. H. S." makes fun of General George B. McClellan:

For the biggest of blowhards that 'ere did appear,
Is George B. McClellan, the bold engineer. . . .
So now we'll take leave with a kick in the rear
Of Geo. B. McClellan, the bold engineer.²¹

Another Baltimore imprint (June 30, 1861) bears the lengthy Latin title of "Quamdiu tandem abutere patientiae nostra? Ad quem finem sese jactabit Audacia?" In these verses "B," who wrote them, ridicules the Union generals, including Scott, McClellan, Butler, Banks, Fremont and Lyon. Butler is the subject of a sarcastic attack in "The Very latest from Butler" in which the writer accuses the general of being more fond of "Booty and Beauty" than the battlefield. A song sheet entitled "General Butler," sung to the tune of "Yankee Doodle," makes fun of Butler's part in the battle of Big Bethel, while "Picayune Butler," set to the air of "All on Hobbies," speaks of Butler "of state prison fame." General Butler was at one time in command of the Union troops in Baltimore. "Duty Done, and Glory Won," printed in Baltimore and written by someone who signs "A Patriot," contains a criticism of General Robert C. Schenck, who also was at another time in command of Federal troops stationed in Baltimore.

One other subject remains to be considered from the southern point of view and that is their attitude towards slavery. One verse was written from what was supposed to be the slave's point of view. In "Our Opinion," the writer, making use of negro dialect, has it appear that a southern mammy really does not want Lincoln's offer of freedom.²²

Opposition to freedom for the Negro is expressed in verses entitled "Epitaph," printed in 1862 before the Emancipation

²¹ In "The Broker's 'Stamp Act' Lament," a Southerner writes that stocks are falling and that McClellan is still on the run. This was printed in July, 1862.

²² The same verses were printed with the title "A Southern Scene."

Proclamation. "Lines on the Proclamation Issued by the Tyrant Lincoln, April First, 1863," written "by a rebel," severely criticize the President for freeing the slaves.

The attempt of the North to arm the Negroes against the South is the subject of satire in "Niggers in Convention. Sumner's Speech." In verses entitled "The Guerillas," which were written by Severn Teackle Wallis while he was imprisoned in the North, a call is issued to the South to resist the Northerners who were turning the slaves against their Southern masters.

In comparison with the number of song sheets which show sympathy for the South, there are few in the Society's collection which favor the Union. Some of the pro-Union ones are Baltimore imprints that give the name of the publisher, such as Louis Bonsal or Thomas G. Doyle. There is also a copy of "The Star Spangled Banner," printed by John D. Toy. Unlike the pro-South song sheets, privately printed in Baltimore, the publisher of song sheets advocating the Union ran no risk of imprisonment, as the city and state were in control of the Federalists.

Two of the Baltimore imprints favorable to the Union were published by Louis Bonsal. One of them with the caption "Cling to the Union" was to be sung to the tune of "Wait for the Wagon." The writer hopes that the people will stand by the Union. The other song sheet published by Bonsal was entitled "Fourth of July Union Song." This was set to the air of "Scots wha hae wi' Wallace bled." The author of these verses expects that people with a common heritage will not be divided, but will "maintain, as now, Union, Liberty!"

There were several pro-Union song sheets published in Baltimore by Thomas G. Doyle. One of them bore the title "Help Us Save the Union," and was sung to the tune of "Dixey's Land." This contains an appeal to save the Union. Another song sheet published by Doyle was "The Flag of Our Union!" some of the lines of which read:

The union of hearts—the union of hands—

And the Flag of the Union—forever and ever! . . .

Doyle also printed "The Old Union Wagon," to the air of "Wait for the Wagon," which advised Americans to "stick to the wagon, the old Union Wagon." By the same publisher was "The Union 'Dixie'" which contains a threat that the Union flag will

soon fly in the South. Another Baltimore imprint by Doyle was entitled "Brave and Saucy" to the tune of "Gay and Happy." In this the author warns the South that—

Fort Sumpter we'll remember too,
That shall be our Lexington! . . .
So let the fight come soon as it will be,
We'll be brave and saucy still. . . .

Printed in Baltimore but with no publisher's name was a song with the title "The Union," which could be sung to the air of "Root Hog or Die." In this the writer says:

The Secessionists in Baltimore, not many weeks ago,
They tried to rule the City, as you very well do know,
They could not come the game, Sir, I'll tell the reason why,
The Union boys made 'em sing-Root Hog or Die.²³

The Society has a number of song sheets with no date or place of publication, but which refer either to Baltimore or to Maryland and to their loyalty to the Union. One of these is entitled "My Maryland," in which the writer applauds Maryland's decision to remain in the Union and adds:

The Stars and Stripes I hope will wave,
In Maryland, my Maryland,
When every traitor's in his grave,
In Maryland, my Maryland.

In "Hurrah! For the Union!" the author is glad that the Union flag is waving again in "dear old Baltimore!" A man who signed "F. H. S. . . ." composed the "Baltimore Union Song!" sung to the tune of "Rosin your Bow." This contains a plea "to drive the serpent Secession away." The writer blames Marshal Kane for the "mob" on April 19th, 1861, when Massachusetts troops passed through Baltimore.

Another pro-Union song sheet entitled "Baltimore Prisoners at Fort Lafayette. Traitor's Doom," was sung to the air of the "Old Grey Goose." These verses favored the imprisonment at this New York fort of all traitors to the Union. "We know our Rights," was sung to the tune of a "Life on the Ocean Wave," at

²³ Another song sheet published by Doyle was "The Zouave Boys" to the tune of "Nelly Bly." This was in praise of these Northern soldiers. A song sheet having the title of "The Stars and Stripes" was published by the *Clipper*, a Baltimore newspaper, and the verses were dedicated to a Wisconsin regiment.

a meeting of the Union League Association held at Monument Square over which Governor Augustus W. Bradford of Maryland presided. The verses contain a plea to stand by the Union.

In the city of Philadelphia there were printed verses written by a man who signed "C. S. S." which are of interest to Baltimoreans. They were entitled "The Slain at Baltimore." The author urges the North to avenge those Federal soldiers shot in the city on April 19, 1861:

There's sorrow and there's weeping by mountain, vale
and shore,

For Freedom's new slain martyrs,—*the Dead at Baltimore!*

In one Philadelphia imprint we find an example of irreligious humor. It is entitled "Johnny's Prayer" and was copied from a Union soldier's letter. It reads:

Our Father!
Who art in Washington,
Uncle Abra'm by name;
Thy Victory's won;
Thy will be done;
In the South,
As in the North;
Give us this day,
Our daily rations,
Of Crackers and Pork,
And forgive our
Failures as we
For give our Quarter Masters,
For their short rations;
For thine is the power;
The Soldier and
The Contraband;
For the space of Three years,
Amen.

One more Pennsylvania imprint remains to be mentioned. It was also probably printed in Philadelphia. It has the caption "Physic for Traitors. The Great Union War Song." On the song sheet is a picture of Jeff Davis hanging from a gallows. The author suggests:

Let us hunt up the rascally Traitors,
And thoroughly physic them now. . . .
Jeff Davis, you poison old adder,
The length of your chain you have run;
You are puff'd up with wind like a bladder,
And we'll bust you as sure as a gun.

These verses were sung to the tune of the "Red, White and Blue."²⁴

One song printed in New York has a romantic flavor. It is entitled "The Captain with his Whiskers as sung by Mrs. W. J. Florence." This tells how a Union captain won the heart of a young girl who sighs:

Oh, my heart was enlisted, and I could not get free,
For the Captain with his whiskers took a sure glance at me.²⁵

In the Society's collection there are a number of song sheets which advocate the preservation of the Union but which have no

²⁴ The following song sheets in favor of the Union were also published in Philadelphia: "Our Beautiful Banner!" written by Mrs. Louis F. Neagle and dedicated to Mrs. Abraham Lincoln. This was sung to the tune of the "Star Spangled Banner." "Freeman Arise," written by William Sutherland, and set to the air of "The American Star."

Song sheets in honor of two Union officers killed in action in Virginia during the Civil War were also published in Philadelphia. One of the officers was Colonel Baker killed in battle near Leesburg, Virginia, on October 21, 1861. The song which honored Baker, who was the commander of a California brigade, was entitled the "Death of Colonel Baker." It was composed by William Sutherland to be sung to the tune of "California Brothers."

The other Union officer was Colonel E. E. Ellsworth who was killed on May 24, 1861, at Alexandria, Virginia. It appears that Colonel Ellsworth, of the New York Zouaves, tried to tear down a Confederate flag which was flying in Alexandria. While attempting to do this he was shot by a Southern soldier named Jackson. In retaliation Corporal Brownell, of the New York Zouaves, then shot Jackson. Three song sheets were printed in Philadelphia to commemorate this dramatic incident. One was written by William Sutherland who composed the one about Colonel Baker, and it is entitled the "Assassination of Colonel Ellsworth at Alexandria, Virginia." It, too, was to be sung to the air of "California Brothers." Of the other two, both published in the same year (1861), one bore the title "In Memory of Col. E. E. Ellsworth," and was written by G. Gumpert, while the third was entitled "On the Death of Col. Ellsworth."

Corporal Brownell who killed Colonel Ellsworth's assailant, was also honored by a song sheet, of which Sutherland was the composer, and who dedicated it to the New York Fire Zouaves. It was entitled "Brownell the Gallant Zouave," and the words were to be sung to the tune of "Rosin the Bow, or Old Tippecanoe."

The South's version of the flag incident at Alexandria is set forth in a song entitled "Jackson's Requiem," set too the air of "Dearest Mae." In the verses Jackson is praised for killing Colonel Ellsworth when he attempted to tear down the Confederate flag.

It is interesting to note that the Society has in its collection verses entitled "Freedom's Banner!!" which was dedicated to the New York Zouaves when they were encamped on Federal Hill, in Baltimore.

²⁵ There are a number of pro-Union song sheets in the Society's collection which were published in New York, such as "Union and Liberty," and "Traitor, Spare that Flag." The latter was to be sung to the tune of "Woodman spare that tree." Another New York imprint was "Sam Houston and the People." This contains a warning that the people of New York are going to invade Texas. Although not printed in New York, "Beauregard's Bells" contains a similar warning to the people of New Orleans. This song sheet was set to the tune of "Picayune Butler's coming, coming."

date or place of publication printed on them. These include "Our Union, Right or Wrong." The author says the Union must be defended:

We know no South, we know no North,
Our Union—right or wrong.

"God Save Our Country," set to the tune of "America," asks divine aid to save the Union. In "The Flag of our Union," sung to the air of "Hail Columbia," the writer feels that the Union flag "will have to do for us all." The "New Yankee Doodle" contains these rollicking verses:

Yankee Doodle—stick to that,
'Twill stand all kinds of weather;
' Hail Columbia '—' Star Spangled Banner '—
Sing 'em all together.²⁶

"Gen. McClellan, the Choice of the Nation," sung to the tune of "The Red, White and Blue," praised the general as "the pride of the fearless and free. . . ." ²⁷

"The French Lady," which was sung to the air of "Sister Mary," describes an incident which happened in Maryland during the Civil War. It appears that Colonel Zarvona Thomas, of the Confederate Army, disguising himself as "a French lady" embarked on a Chesapeake Bay boat which was bound for Washington. At the opportune time he discarded his disguise and, gaining control of captain and crew, he took the vessel to Virginia. Colonel Thomas, however, made the mistake of returning to Baltimore on another boat. Upon his arrival at the city, General Banks, in command of Federal troops there, had him arrested. Thomas was discovered attempting to hide in a bureau-drawer in the women's cabin.

In every war women play an important part and this was true

²⁶ The following song sheets in favor of the Union also have no date or place of publication stated: "Bully for All"; "Over the Left," to the air of "Sweet Kitty Clover"; "The Union Yankee Doodle"; "Secession over Jordan," by H. Angelo, and "The New C. S. A." to the tune of "Vive-la-Campagne." The last named song urged loyalty to the Union and "groans for the C. S. A."

²⁷ In the same vein is "On to Victory. Gen. McClellan's War Song!" which praised the general and those who fought with him. There are also song sheets in praise of Generals Lyon and Scott. One is entitled "On the Death of General Lyon, who fell on the Battlefield," and was to be sung to the air of "Burial of Sir John Moore." The other bore the title of "Scott and the Veteran." This song sheet was written by Bayard Taylor and was published in Baltimore by Thomas G. Doyle.

THE BALTIMORE GIRLS.



Tune—"Dearest Mae."

Oh the Girls of dear old Baltimore,
So beautiful and fair,
With eyes like diamonds sparkling,
And richly flowing hair.
Their hearts are light and cheerful,
And their spirits ever gay,
The Girls of dear old Baltimore,
How beautiful are they.

They smile when we are happy,
When we are sad they sigh,
When anguish wrings our bosoms,
The tear they gently dry,
Oh happy is this city that owns their tender sway,
The Girls of dear old Baltimore,
How beautiful are they.

They are like the lovely flowers,
In summer time that bloom,
On the sportive breezes shedding,
Their choice and sweet perfume,
Our eyes and hearts delighting,
With their fanciful array,
The Girls of dear old Baltimore,
How beautiful are they.

Then ever like true patriots,
May we join both heart and hand,
To protect our lovely maidens
Of this our down trod land,
And that heaven may ever bless them,
We'll all devoutly pray,
The Girls of dear old Baltimore,
How beautiful are they.

Pledge to the Fair by a Confederate

From the Society's Collection

during the Civil War. Most of them in Baltimore were, as was the case with the men, southern in their sympathies. Song sheets in the Society's collection pay tribute to Maryland women. One of them entitled "Southern Prisoner gives his thanks to the Baltimore Ladies," was sung to the tune of "American Boy." In this song a Confederate soldier expresses his appreciation for the kind treatment he received from Baltimore women while imprisoned in the city. Wrote the young man:

The ladies in Baltimore I never shall forget,
The kindest ladies I ever saw, live in Baltimore yet.

The Rev. George C. Smith was the author of another tribute in verses entitled "The Women of Baltimore." Dr. Smith commented on the care which they gave to Confederate prisoners in Baltimore:

To those who cheered the poor prisoner,
When he his manacles wore,
A crown shall be given, the brightest—
The women of Baltimore.

One song sheet, sung to the tune of "Dearest Mae," and entitled "The Baltimore Girls" contains a promise that "the girls of dear old Baltimore, so beautiful and fair" will be protected while the city is in control of Union troops.

In some songs Southern women praise the men who are fighting for the Confederacy. "The Southern Men," by "A Southern Lady," is of this description. "The Southern Matron to her Son," written to the air of "Oh No, My Love, No," describes the scene as a mother parts from her son who is off to fight for the South. In "The Confederate Soldier's Wife parting from her Husband!" we see how Southern women felt towards men fighting for the Confederacy:

Go forth to conquer; where
The battle rages fiercest thou wilt be,
And I will glory that my Love is there
Struggling for Liberty.²⁸

²⁸ "A Mother's Prayer," by Mrs. Margaret Piggot, was published in Baltimore during April, 1861. She wrote the prayer the night after the Sixth Massachusetts Regiment had been fired on while passing through Baltimore on April 19th. Mrs. Piggot hoped for peace.

On April 9th, 1866, after the end of the Civil War, Mrs. Annie Southcomb published some verses in Baltimore entitled "After the War." The lines, written for the Southern Relief Fair, contain a description of the distressing conditions in the South.

The romantic side of the Civil War is stressed in two song sheets, one printed in Richmond in 1861, and the other published in Baltimore during the same year. The Virginia imprint bears the title "Address to her Maryland Lover by a Virginia Girl." It was signed by "M. F. Q." and the words could be sung to the tune of "Fly to the Desert." In these verses the Virginia girl exhorts her Maryland lover to fight for the South and adds:

Then fly with me, if thou dost claim,
Thy Southern rights and Southern name.

In Baltimore was printed the "Reply to the Virginian Girl's Address to her Maryland Lover." It was signed by "O. H. S." who assures his sweetheart:

I'm off for the South,
Come, who'll go with me,
I'm bound for Virginia
My true love to see.²⁹

There is only one song sheet in the Society's collection written by a woman which expresses loyalty to the Union. It was entitled "Our Union Flag," and was to be sung to the air of "Nellie Gray." This song which was published by Thomas G. Doyle, of Baltimore, states that it is written by "A Lady of Baltimore." In it the author makes a plea to save the Union—

And never shall the morn,
See our banner stain'd and torn,
By disunion. . . .

The last song sheet to be considered is one which has the rather curious title of "The Ladies of Baltimore, God Bless them, they have beautiful Turned up Noses." The author, who is a Northerner, pokes fun at the women of Baltimore who, he thinks,

²⁹ It would be interesting to identify "M. F. Q." and "O. H. S."

favor the South and he warns them that there is no hope of Maryland joining the Confederacy:

Our father's Flag, it waves once more,
In Maryland! my Maryland!
Secession's dead in Baltimore,
Through Maryland! my Maryland!⁸⁰

⁸⁰ On the subject of Civil War song sheets the following books, among others, can be consulted: *Rebel Rhymes and Rhapsodies*, edited by Frank Moore (New York, 1864); *Camp Songs for the Soldier and Poems of Leisure Moments*, by Gen'l William H. Hayward (Baltimore, 1864); *South Songs from the Lays of Later Days*, edited by T. C. De Leon (New York, 1866); *War-Lyrics and other Poems*, by Henry Howard Brownell (Boston, 1866); *War Poetry of the South*, edited by Wm. Gilmore Simms (New York, 1867); *The Southern Poems of the War*, edited by Emily V. Mason (Baltimore, 1868); *Songs and Ballads of the Southern People, 1861-1865*, edited by Frank Moore (New York, 1886); *Southern War Songs*, edited by W. L. Fagan (New York, 1892); *War Songs and Poems of the Southern Confederacy, 1861-1865*, edited by H. M. Wharton, D.D. (Philadelphia, 1904).

Many of the song sheets which have been described in this article were donated to the Society by the late H. Oliver Thompson, Henry Stockbridge and Elizabeth Collins Lee. Mr. Louis H. Dielman, of the Peabody Institute, and several others have also contributed a number of song sheets. The Society is grateful for these donations and hopes that others will follow their example.

POLITICS IN MARYLAND DURING THE CIVIL WAR

By CHARLES BRANCH CLARK

(Continued from Vol. XXXVII, page 399, December, 1942)

UNIONIST DOMINATION, NOVEMBER 1861–NOVEMBER 1864

SINCE the elections of November, 1861, indicated that the legislature would be controlled by the Unionists, Governor Hicks decided to summon that body into special session, in order to align the State with the North in defense of the Union. He therefore issued a call on November 16 for the legislature to assemble in Annapolis on December 3.¹

On the day the legislature met, the *Baltimore American* said now that "treason is frowned down; the loyal are reassured; and commercial prosperity is in process of restoration." It congratulated Maryland for remaining in the Union after coming so close to secession. "Looking back in the past six months, it is difficult to conceive how any amongst us can withstand the demonstration of that wise forbearance which has saved us from so much of evil . . ." The legislature, said this journal, should pass measures to aid in the suppression of the rebellion. It should also "recognize by its formal action," the invaluable services of Governor Hicks, and "his noble firmness, which would be but poorly repaid could these be commemorated by the erection of a statue of gold."²

Governor Hicks, in his message to the legislature on December 4, attempted to justify his actions of the preceding twelve months. He said the course followed on April 19 was the only one open to him. He had feared that the secessionists would adopt violent measures if he openly resisted them. He believed his official conduct was irreproachable and that it was approved by the majority in Maryland. Hicks said he had refused to call a special session of the legislature earlier than April because he feared that "through some juggle Maryland would be forced to secede." Once the legislature did meet, it passed "treasonable" resolu-

¹ G. L. P. Radcliffe, *Governor Thomas H. Hicks of Maryland and the Civil War* (J. H. U. Studies) (1901), p. 119; *Appleton's Annual Cyclopaedia*, I (1861), 448.

² December 3, 1861.

tions, and only the "unmistakable threats of an aroused and indignant people" prevented it from authorizing a State convention that might have led to secession. The people's money had been "squandered" and the legislature had become a "mockery before the country." Hicks said that it was necessary for the present legislature to counteract the work of the April session, controlled as it had been by a band of "traitors," and prove Maryland's devotion to the Union. He urged that the legislature make arrangements to equip the soldiers called for in Maryland's quota, and promptly pay the State's share of the direct taxes levied by the United States government.³

The *Baltimore American* characterized Hicks's message as "eminently loyal and patriotic, and marked by the intelligent, practical good sense characteristic of its author."⁴ It approved Hicks's avowal that Maryland would do her part in suppressing the rebellion, and severely punish anyone in the State convicted of aiding or abetting those in arms against the government. Hicks himself was characterized as a "stanch sentinel on the watchtower of the nation," and the "custodian of—the bulwark to—the national capital as well."⁵

The legislature endeavored to undo all that its predecessor had done in opposing the Federal administration. Its chief measure repealed the act passed in April which indemnified Baltimore officials for penalties incurred in suppressing disorder on April 19.⁶ Few measures of importance were passed by the special session of the legislature. On December 19, a joint committee was appointed to interview General McClellan and "solicit the adoption of some plan to prevent the admission of fugitive slaves, within the lines of the Army."⁷ A set of resolutions that defended the Federal government's prosecution of the war was adopted. These declared that the war was not one of subjugation, conquest, interference with the institution of slavery, or with the rights of the states, but one waged to defend the Union.⁸

³ *Maryland House Documents* (1861-1862), Doc. A; *Baltimore American*, December 5, 1861.

⁴ December 5, 1861.

⁵ December 6, 1861.

⁶ *Laws of Maryland* (1861-1862), Chapter 13. Passed January 4, 1862.

⁷ *Maryland Senate Journal* (1861-1862), p. 44; *Maryland House Journal* (1861-1862), pp. 92-93; *Laws of Maryland* (1861-1862), Resolution No. 2.

⁸ *Laws of Maryland* (1861-1862), pp. 332-334.

While the Maryland legislature was in special session, the Virginia legislature invited Enoch Louis Lowe, former Governor of Maryland, to "occupy one of the privileged seats on the floor of the Hall." Lowe had been an active supporter of James Buchanan in 1856, and of John C. Breckinridge in 1860. When the war broke out he remained in Baltimore so long as he could safely aid the South and so long as he thought there was a chance for Maryland to secede. He had openly proclaimed his sympathy for the Southern cause. In his reply to the Virginia legislature, Lowe expressed his earnest desire that Maryland should secede.⁹ He believed that ultimately such would be the case.

God knows [he declared] they [Marylanders] love the sunny South as dearly as any son of the Palmetto State. They idolize the chivalrous honor, the stern and refined idea of free government, the social dignity and conservatism which characterize the southern mind and heart as enthusiastically as those of their southern brethren who were born where the snow never falls.

He bitterly denounced Hicks, who, as Maryland's "false-hearted" Governor, had "purposely left her [Maryland] in a defenseless condition, in order that he might without peril to himself deliver her up at the suitable time to be crucified and receive his thirty pieces of silver as the price of his unspeakable treachery."¹⁰ Lowe thought Maryland's fate was closely tied up with Virginia's, and believed the State could be of tremendous help to the Confederacy.

The regular session of the legislature met on January 1, a week before Bradford was inaugurated Governor. Hicks made his last address to the legislature on January 2. He congratulated the members on the work they had completed or begun in the special session of December; but he was concerned chiefly with questions of State finance and public improvements.¹¹ Hicks surrendered his office at a time when a loyal legislature had assembled and when the Unionists were fairly certain to control the State. A strong

⁹ Enoch Louis Lowe to James L. Kemper, Speaker of the Virginia House of Delegates. The letter was printed in the *Richmond Dispatch*, December 28, 1861, the *Baltimore South*, December 30, 1861, and the *Maryland News Sheet*, December 31, 1861.

¹⁰ The *South*, Baltimore, December 30, 1861.

¹¹ Maryland House Documents (1861-1862), Doc. B; *Baltimore American*, January 3, 1862; *Maryland News Sheet*, January 3, 1862.

secession sentiment still lurked in Maryland, however. The *Baltimore American* said: "It parades our streets with impudent sneers at everything loyal; flaunts itself in our churches and public assemblies; insults the Union sentiment on all occasions; and every week almost, is caught affording aid and comfort to the enemy . . . " ¹²

The newspapers commented upon Hicks's retirement from office according to their degree of loyalty to the Union. He was highly praised by the most loyal papers. The *American* believed that his term was remarkable for the "extraordinary events with which it is filled and for its *National* rather than its local importance."¹³ His action in not convening the legislature during the preceding winter was again praised by this paper. "For four months of the winter of 1860-1861, it may be said that Governor Hicks was the sole sentinel and guard of Washington." He was credited with having saved Maryland for the Union, and thereby having saved the national capital.¹⁴

The Baltimore *South*, however, had little praise for Hicks. An article for the occasion was entitled "Exit Hicks," and concluded "Peace to the ashes of Hicks." It stated that he had been elected in 1857 "by the perpetration of the most barefaced frauds upon the election franchise." And since January 1, 1861, his letters, speeches, and actions "would display an amount of contradiction and self stultification sufficient to put even a brazen image to the blush,—but Hicks has forgotten how to do that."¹⁵ From St. Mary's county came the expressions which best characterized the secessionists of the State. The *St. Mary's Beacon* commented on Hicks's retirement as follows:

We too, in common with the administration press of the State, have a word of congratulation on the subject of Governor Hicks' message. We congratulate ourselves that it is the last. It is impossible to say what future evils Heaven may have in store for our unhappy State, but unless it is given over to final perdition, it will never again be afflicted with another Hicks. We know but little of our new ruler, Mr. Bradford, and nothing to his credit. He is said to be a man of exceedingly little feeling

¹² January 4, 1862. The editorial from which this is taken is entitled: "The Imperative Necessity of Vindicating The Position of Maryland."

¹³ January 6, 1862.

¹⁴ *Ibid.* See the issue of January 9, 1862, for similar sentiments from an Annapolis correspondent.

¹⁵ January 8, 1862.

and of strong Abolition proclivities. Be it so. We welcome any change that liberates us from the vulgar dominion of a government pimp and informer. Hicks is the first governor in our history that Maryland has had to blush for. He may not be the last, but none lower than he can come after him. His present message is neither better nor worse than those which have preceded it, and, indeed, there is a pretty strong family likeness between them—We have noticed that he is fond of referring in deprecating and slanderous terms to those good, great and brave men who are now suffering for Maryland in Fort Warren. He is not worthy to tie their shoe-strings. The best thing he can do for them is to hate them, and such as he is may all that ever hate them be.¹⁶

Despite such dissenting opinions, the people of Maryland generally and sincerely respected Governor Hicks. Once he decided to support the Union he did so with all his strength and his course became a steadfast one.

Various proposals were brought forward to reward Hicks for his services to the Union. The Baltimore *South* reported that he had been promoted to the position of major-general in the United States Army, and was to succeed General Dix as commanding officer of the Department of Maryland. "This is substituting King Stork for King Log. All hail to Hicks, *redivivus*," said the *South*.¹⁷ This report turned out to be groundless, but there were other rumors that Hicks would be named commander of one of the military divisions into which Maryland had been divided.¹⁸ The *New York Tribune* suggested that Hicks be appointed Secretary of the Navy to succeed Gideon Welles, who was believed ready to resign.¹⁹ Lincoln did appoint Hicks a brigadier-general and he was directed by Secretary of War Stanton to report to Governor Bradford on July 26.²⁰ Hicks was in poor health at the time and did not enter upon the duties of this assignment. He received his reward, however, when the legislature elected him to fill out the unexpired term of United States Senator James Alfred Pearce who died in December, 1862.

Governor Bradford's inauguration was a colorful event, long remembered by all those who were in attendance. Many citizens arrived at the capital the evening before from Baltimore and

¹⁶ Reprinted in the *Maryland News Sheet*, January 11, 1862.

¹⁷ January 11, 1862.

¹⁸ G. W. Jefferson to Hicks, January 17, 1862. See Radcliffe, *op. cit.*, p. 122.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*

²⁰ Hicks to Bradford, cited by Radcliffe, *op. cit.*, p. 122.

other parts of the State. The crowd was so great that many were unable to procure beds and were compelled to sleep on sofas and benches in the various hotels and boarding houses. The Senate Chamber, scene of the inauguration, was filled at an early hour on January 8. General Ambrose E. Burnside and other army officers were present. Many women gladly sat on the floor, for the doors were closed to an overflowing crowd. The bands of the Public Guard Regiment and the Eleventh Pennsylvania Regiment were stationed in the gallery and during the ceremony added to the interest of the occasion by playing appropriate airs. Despite the large crowd and excitement, the greatest decorum prevailed.²¹

Bradford's inaugural address was generally characterized as able and eloquent.²² What he said was not new to the people of Maryland, for Bradford had made his position clear in his gubernatorial campaign and at various Union meetings. He bitterly condemned the rebellion, and expressed his unqualified support of the Union and the Constitution. The following excerpt gives the tenor of the address:

The leaders of the rebellion may assert over and over again that the South never will submit to this national rule—that it will resist to the last the proposed reunion. So far as those leaders are concerned, we may not doubt the sincerity of their protest; their offences against free institutions are too rank and too recent to allow them willingly again to submit to the will of the majority. But to say nothing of that popular voice which they have for the present stifled, to admit, for argument sake, that one sentiment pervades the entire South, and that it clamors for a separate government; earnest as that purpose may be, there is a still stronger force opposed to it, not merely the force of a vast numerical superiority, but a power made irresistible by the force of necessity; a controlling and decisive power, growing out of the demands which the laws of self-preservation make imperative. Nationality with us, therefore, is a necessity and peace, anxiously as we may await it, can never come until that necessity is recognized, and our whole country once more united under its old established rule.

The *Baltimore American* said this address was "one of those sterling productions bearing on the exigencies of the times, clear in its appreciation of the great events of the day in all their bearings and wise in its dealings with them." It was one "that every

²¹ *Baltimore American*, January 9, 1862.

²² For the address see *Maryland House Documents* (1862), Doc. F; *Baltimore American*, January 9, 1862; *Appleton's*, II (1862), 560. It was also printed in pamphlet form.

lover of the Union in the State can most heartily endorse, and in calling attention to its prominent points we do so with a thorough belief in its wisdom and conservatism, fully justified by the antecedents of its distinguished author." Bradford was said to be "firm in his convictions and plain and determined in the expression of them."²³ An Annapolis correspondent said the "address is highly spoken of by all who heard it, and seems to meet with the general approbation it deserves. No doubt the people when they come to read it will be rejoiced to find that the principles there enunciated are but the principles of themselves."²⁴

The *Baltimore Sun*, however, was not impressed by the address. It found the "subject matter confined mainly to a review of the condition of the State and its relation to current events, according to Mr. Bradford's appreciation and construction of them." The *Sun* agreed, however, with the Governor's stand against interference with slavery in Maryland, and felt that the State held the same opinion thereon.²⁵

The legislature of 1862 was one of marked ability.²⁶ The House of Delegates counted among its members the famed Reverdy Johnson; John A. J. Creswell, later a United States Senator; Thomas S. Alexander; Thomas King Carroll; R. Stockett Matthews; J. V. L. Findlay, and John S. Berry.

One of the first acts of the regular session was to ratify the pending amendment that forbade any amendment to the Federal Constitution that would give Congress the power to abolish or interfere with the domestic institution of African slavery in any of the states.²⁷ An act was passed creating the "Maryland Defense Loan," for the defense of the State, and a sum was appropriated sufficient to pay the State's share to the United States for suppress-

²³ January 10, 1862.

²⁴ *Baltimore American*, January 9, 1862.

²⁵ January 10, 1862.

²⁶ The new legislature, elected on November 6, 1861, had a strong Union preponderance. In the Senate there were thirteen Unionists and eight State Rights men. In the House of Delegates there were sixty-eight Unionists and six State Rights men. *National Intelligencer*, November 12, 1861; see also Bradford's tabulated statement, citing the above figures for the House of Delegates, and assigning two of the six State Rights men to St. Mary's County, two to Calvert, and two to Charles County, Bradford MSS.

²⁷ *Maryland House Journal* (1862), pp. 164, 173; *Maryland Senate Journal* (1862), p. 97; *Laws of Maryland* (1862), Chapter 21, pp. 21-22. Passed on January 10.

ing the rebellion and maintaining the integrity of the Union.²⁸ The sum of \$7,000 was appropriated for the families of the members of the Sixth Massachusetts Regiment who were killed or disabled in Baltimore on April 19, 1861. John A. Andrews, Governor of Massachusetts, was to distribute the sum.²⁹

The House of Delegates, almost by unanimous vote, denounced the assertion made by Jefferson Davis in a speech at Richmond on February 22, 1862. Davis had said: "Maryland, already united to us by hallowed ties and natural interests, will when able to speak with an unstified voice, unite her destiny with the South."³⁰ The House repudiated this statement in a resolution that also contradicted resolutions adopted by the rebellious legislature of 1861.

Resolved, by the General Assembly of Maryland, That such assertion is an unfounded and gross calumny upon the people of the State, who, sincerely lamenting the madness of self-inflicted misfortune of our brethren of the South, acting under a delusion caused by the acts of the aspiring and criminal ambition of a few designing men, are but admonished by the sad condition of such brethren, of the fatal results sure to follow from the course which they have pursued, and are more and more convinced of the obligation, alike of interest and duty, to abide, with undying attachment, to the Union devised for us by our fathers, as absolutely necessary to our social and political happiness, and the preservation of the very liberty which they fought and bled to achieve for us.³¹

The most important law passed by this legislature defined treason and fixed the penalty for it.³² Passed only after very lengthy debate, the law was an exceedingly stringent one. It inflicted the death penalty on any one who should be convicted of treasonably levying "war against this State, or shall adhere to the enemies thereof, whether foreign or domestic, giving them aid or comfort, within this State or elsewhere." It also prescribed various degrees of punishment for numerous offenses, such as conspiring to burn bridges, destroy railroads, break canals, or uniting with or belonging to any secret club or association attempting to effect, promote,

²⁸ *Laws of Maryland* (1861-1862), Chapter 143, pp. 154-157.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, Chapter 99, pp. 105-106. Passed March 5, 1862. This act caused a marked sensation when read before the Massachusetts House of Representatives. *Boston Post*, April 22, 1862, cited by Moore, *Rebellion Record*, IV, "Diary," p. 96.

³⁰ *Maryland House Journal* (1862), p. 586; Moore, *op. cit.*, IV, "Diary," p. 40.

³¹ *Maryland House Journal* (1862), p. 586.

³² *Laws of Maryland* (1862), Chapter 235, pp. 250-254. See the *Baltimore American*, March 15, 1862, for this bill. Also J. T. Scharf, *History of Maryland* (1879), III, 465-466.

or encourage the secession of Maryland. Such minor offenses as displaying the Confederate flag; offering inducements to any minor or other person to abandon his home or place of residence to go into a rebellious State; furnishing to any minor or any other person money, clothing, or conveyance of any kind for such an object; giving aid or comfort to the enemies of the State; exciting rebellion, or seducing anyone to such acts were to be punished. This act, passed on March 6, 1862, was to become effective on April 1, but its provisions were never enforced. A contemporary historian reports that he knew of no instance in which parties were arrested and punished under its provisions.³³

The treason act was evidence of a strong Union sentiment in the legislature, and the State at large seemed to support the measure. The fact that it was not enforced, however, either indicates that the rebel sympathizers were properly warned by its provisions and gave no additional trouble, or that its provisions were considered too stringent to enforce. In the light of trouble given to the State officials by the Southern sympathizers in subsequent months, the latter deduction seems to be the more valid one. Another act deprived any person charged with treason or felony of the writ of habeas corpus.³⁴

A strong Southern feeling continued to exist among certain groups in Maryland. A correspondent to the *Boston Journal* of January 14, 1862, reported that the "latest scoundrelism of secession" showed itself in the election of executive officers of the Baltimore Corn Exchange, "an important and hitherto respectable mercantile Association."³⁵ The Union members, "not wishing to carry politics into business, and like good citizens striving to live peaceably with their neighbors," abstained from voting against the secession members of the old board; but the secessionists of the Corn Exchange not only elected a man president who was then a prisoner at Fort Warren, but voted against every Union member of the board. Consequently, said this correspondent, the board became exclusively a disunion one. Whereupon the loyal members met and denounced such conduct, organized themselves into a new exchange, and planned to seek from the legislature a charter of

³³ Scharf, *op. cit.*, III, 465-466.

³⁴ *Laws of Maryland* (1862), Chapter 36, pp. 47-48.

³⁵ Reprinted in *Baltimore South*, January 20, 1862.

their own and a suspension of the charter held by the secession board. "The incident . . . shows the bitter intolerance of secession, which intends to taboo every loyal man socially, politically, and in mercantile affairs. The Union men tolerate secession, but if secession ever gets the upper hand here, it will put the knife to every loyalist's throat." The whole conduct of the secessionists was called "rebellious, treasonable, merciless, murderous, infamous, crazy with the foulest passions."³⁶

The Union leaders attempted to clarify their position on political issues and party politics at a banquet given for General Robert C. Schenck, commander of the Middle Department, in January, 1863. Governor Bradford, speaking for the Unionists, said:

The Loyal men of Maryland . . . have no parties to sustain, no parties to create, no parties to revive. They have no presidents to make, no presidents to recommend. Were the presidential election to come off in a month, Maryland's loyal men would not rest their hopes on the Republican party or the Democratic party, or the old line Whig party. They would propose no candidate but a pure *Pro Patria*, Anti-rebellion honest man, and that alone would fill up the measure of their candidate for the Presidency. They know full well that however much any one party may have had to do in tearing down the fair fabric which was once such a pride of all of us, that no one party can of themselves ever build it up again . . .

. . . The loyal men of Maryland have but one purpose and one hope, but one ambition and one thought, and that is the *Union*, its restoration, its preservation, its perpetuity. We would save it at all hazards, and if not with all the improvements that some of us might suggest, then with all the interests and institutions that have ever found shelter beneath it. He would then, at least, be saving it in the identical shape in which our fathers themselves received it from their own patriotic ancestry. We would, therefore, save the Ark and all that it contains, every bird and every beast, and every creeping thing that ever found refuge beneath its roof. But if this be not possible, and some must be thrown overboard, then let them go I say—sacred, patriarchal, though some may regard them—go to the very depths of the sea, so that we may save the ark itself with its precious freight of popular government, public liberty, republican institutions, religious toleration, the home of our children, the hope of the universe . . .³⁷

³⁶ *Ibid.*, The *South* argued this point, saying that according to the *Baltimore Clipper* and *American*, Baltimore, from April 18 to April 28, 1861, was controlled by a "secession mob." Yet during that time, says the *South*, "no one was molested—no one was imprisoned or injured—and if any person sneaked from the city, after the style of Mr. Henry Winter Davis and some others whom we could name, their guilty fears and natural cowardice prompted the step, and not the threats or menaces of the secessionists."

³⁷ *Biographical Cyclopaedia of Representative Men of Maryland and the District of Columbia* (1879), p. 34.

Early in 1863 the Unionists held conferences to plan how "they might . . . more effectually . . . sustain the National Administration in its great struggles."³⁸ At one of these meetings, held at Cumberland on April 30, resolutions calling for a state convention were adopted. Accordingly, the Grand League issued a call for a state convention to assemble in Baltimore on June 16, 1863.³⁹ The call was addressed to "all persons who support the whole policy of the Government in suppressing the rebellion." Before this convention met, however, Unionists of both radical and conservative character met in Baltimore on May 23 and nominated candidates for Congress for the Maryland districts. John A. J. Creswell, Edwin H. Webster, Henry Winter Davis, Francis Thomas, and John G. Holland were named as candidates from the First, Second, Third, Fourth, and Fifth Districts, respectively. Davis was said to have strong opposition from the conservative leader, Thomas Swann,⁴⁰ but was nominated by a vote of 45-2. There was no opposition to the other candidates. Nomination for State comptroller, for commissioner of the land office, and for the legislature were also to be made, but because of friction between the radical and conservative Unionists the convention broke up without completing its work. The former decided to meet again in the Grand League Convention already slated to meet on June 16, while the conservatives set June 23 for a meeting.

The Grand League Convention met on June 16 and adopted resolutions asserting that the unconditional Union men of Maryland should vote only for candidates who pledged themselves to a hearty and full support for the administration. Nor should any candidate be supported for the State legislature who did not

³⁸ *Appleton's*, III (1863), 615-616. The following discussion is also drawn from this source.

³⁹ See *Baltimore American*, May 13, 1863, for an account of the Cumberland meeting. The most prominent speaker was ex-governor Francis Thomas, then a Congressman, who fully supported President Lincoln's policies. Three resolutions were passed. The first concurred in support of Lincoln and urged the organization of a new party whose object would be to support the administration in all its measures. The second resolution called for a convention, and the third provided for the selection of a county delegate. The *Baltimore American* urged that the coming election decide for all time the loyalty of Maryland, and that secession be "humbled, defeated, overthrown," so that it might become a "thing—a horror—of the past."

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, June 6, 1863. Many delegates who favored Swann refused to participate in the nominating convention because of alleged frauds in the choice of delegates to the convention.

pledge himself to vote for a constitutional convention that would adopt emancipation in Maryland. This convention appointed a committee to confer with the conservatives when they met on June 23 in an attempt to agree on candidates for State offices and the legislature, and adjourned to reassemble on June 23.

The conventions of the Grand League and the conservative Unionists both assembled on June 23. For the sake of distinction the former was called the Union League Convention and the latter the State Central Committee Convention. The committee of conference of the Union League Convention proposed to a similar committee of the State Central Committee Convention that the conventions should unite in a call for a third convention at which nominations should be made jointly for comptroller, land commissioner, and the State legislature. The proposition was declined, however, and since its adoption had been made an alternative, the two conventions henceforth acted independently of each other. The State Central Committee adopted a series of resolutions that declared loyalty and support to the Union and the Constitution, and rebuked "with cordial alacrity every effort to create disunion by the formation of parties or factions opposed to the Government or injurious to the Constitution." The resolutions demanded that personal feelings and differences on subordinate issues and State policies should be cast aside. After nominating S. S. Maffit for comptroller and William L. W. Seabrook for land commissioner, and a State ticket, the convention adjourned.⁴¹

The Union League Convention also named William L. W. Seabrook for land commissioner, but chose Henry Howe Goldsborough for comptroller. A full State ticket of Unconditional Unionists was nominated and resolutions were adopted supporting the Federal administration in all its measures to suppress the rebellion. Another resolution stated that love of the Union and support of the administration could not be separated, and if the Union and the Constitution were favored, the administration must necessarily be supported. This resolution was aimed at the State Central Convention which favored the Union and the Constitution but protested what it called the administration's high-handed methods.⁴²

⁴¹ *Appleton's*, III (1863), 615-616.

⁴² *Ibid.*

The split among the Unionists caused much bitterness, and some peculiar situations arose. Unconditional Unionists gained control of a meeting held at Snow Hill, nominated a ticket for Worcester County, and endorsed John A. J. Creswell for Representative in Congress. The conservative Unionists, led by Congressman Crisfield who sought re-election from the First District, objected to the candidates. Crisfield's friends adopted the platform of the Union State Central Committee and placed an independent Union ticket in the field. They approved Lincoln's course in suppressing the war but objected to the injection of the emancipation question in the election. The Unconditional Unionists tried to have members of the conservative Union group arrested.⁴³

Leaders of the Democratic party, which had put no candidates in the field since the 1860 elections, attempted to reinvigorate their party. Most of the counties of the Eastern Shore and of Southern Maryland held conventions and nominated candidates for the legislature. But in some cases they ran as Peace men rather than Democrats. In the Fifth Congressional District, however, the Democrats entered the election openly. They held a District Convention and nominated Benjamin G. Harris for Congress. Their position is clearly stated in the following resolutions:

Resolved, That as Union men, we are not only opposed to emancipation in this State, but even to all agitation of the question at this time as premature and unwise, and likely to cause division where there should be a Union, and permanent discord where there should be abiding harmony.

Resolved, That we support the Union for the sake of the Constitution, and are opposed to the exercise by the general government of all unauthorized powers, deeming it of little consequence if the Constitution is to be sacrificed, whether it is effected by usurpation or rebellion.

Resolved, That our devotion for the Union increases with its perils; and regarding it as the palladium of our liberties, the ark of true republicanism, and the hope and asylum of the oppressed of all nations, we yield it our heart-felt allegiance, and will ever support it by legal and constitutional means.⁴⁴

The temperate tone of these resolutions won many votes for Harris.

The Unionist conventions tended to drive most of the secession-

⁴³ S. S. McMaster of Newtown, Worcester County, to A. W. Bradford, October 20, 1863, Bradford MSS.

⁴⁴ *Appleton's*, III (1863), 618.

ists in the State to cover. The *Baltimore American* said that at "all events Baltimore is a loyal, quiet, well-regulated city. . . . Aye! Copperheads in Baltimore know too well the value of their heads to attempt their unseemly wagging among us. . . ." They have been taught "in many ways, that the Union men of Baltimore, even were there no military regime to sustain them, are quite equal to any demand which may be made upon them for self-protection." Loyal men were declared to be "vigilant, full of nerve, of confidence in themselves, unified by proper organization, and ready to demonstrate their strength whenever Copperheads attempt to sting."⁴⁵

An important Union meeting, presided over by Governor Bradford, was held in Baltimore on July 28. It adopted a resolution requesting President Lincoln to "instruct the general in command of this Military Department to require all male citizens above the age of eighteen" to take an oath to "maintain the national sovereignty paramount to that of all State, county, or corporate powers," and to "discourage, discountenance, and forever oppose secession, rebellion, and the distintegration of the Federal Union." Those refusing to take this oath were to be banished from their homes. The upper branch of the Baltimore city council adopted a resolution requesting General John E. Wool to "administer such an oath to all the citizens of the City of Baltimore at the earliest possible period." General Wool denied this request because he believed the oath would "send twenty thousand men to swell the army of Jefferson Davis."⁴⁶

The question of emancipation led to a complete division of the Unionist party in the fall of 1863. Members of the group headed by the State Central Committee became known as Union men while the "Union Leaguers" were called Unconditional Unionists. The State Central Committee, composed of Thomas Swann, former Mayor of Baltimore, who was chairman, and Governor Bradford, William H. Purnell, Edwin Webster, Mayor Chapman, J. V. L. Findlay, and Judge William Alexander,⁴⁷ issued an

⁴⁵ July 18, 1863.

⁴⁶ J. T. Scharf, *Chronicles of Baltimore* (1874), pp. 626-627.

⁴⁷ Aloysius Leo Knott, *A Biographical Sketch of A. Leo Knott With a Relation of Some Political Transactions in Maryland, 1861-1867, Being the History of the Redemption of a State* (1898), pp. 36-37. Knott was a leader of the reorganized or revived Democratic party of 1864 in Maryland. He ran for Congress against Colonel Charles E. Phelps of the Third District, Baltimore.

address to the people of Maryland on September 11 advising them not to follow the ultra views of the Unconditional Unionists who demanded immediate emancipation, without regard to constitutional rights or reasonable convenience of slaveholders. The question of emancipation, said this address, should not be paramount as an issue in the coming election since it would distract the harmony of the Union party. Constitutional means alone should be employed in the emancipation of slaves. A state convention was favored to settle the issue after the rebellion was suppressed. Union men, it was declared, consisted of emancipationists and slaveholders alike, and the former should not be allowed to alienate the support of the latter. All side issues must be ignored in order to maintain a united front.⁴⁸

The Unconditional Unionists were not to be outdone and five days later met and issued an address of their own. This group, considered revolutionary by the conservative Unionists, numbered among its foremost members Henry Winter Davis, John A. J. Creswell, Judge Hugh Lennox Bond, Henry Howe Goldsborough, Archibald Stirling, Jr., Henry Stockbridge, and Stockett Matthews. They claimed to have the support of a majority of the rank and file of the people.⁴⁹ They declared that they also opposed the violent abolition of slavery, but they believed that it should be abolished at the earliest moment compatible with the best interests of the State and the "permanent welfare, stability, and unity of the nation." Emancipation, they believed, would eliminate the major cause of the war and help bring on peace. For this reason they would support candidates in November who favored a State convention. This group also differed from the conservative Unionists by favoring the use of Negro troops. Owners of slaves who were enlisted, however, should be compensated.

The *Baltimore American* considered this a "most able and straightforward" position and supported it fully. It

regretted that there should be any division among our loyal voters, but when we look back to the course of most of our Representatives in the last Congress, and observe the weak and unwilling support they gave to the government, and in some cases their position of direct antagonism to important measures, such a result was to be anticipated. These are not times to trust uncertain men with the powers of legislation or official

⁴⁸ *Appleton's*, III (1863), 615-616.

⁴⁹ Knott, *A Biographical Sketch*, p. 37.

position. Men who insert 'ifs' and 'buts' in their platform for sustaining the Union, and supporting the Government in the prosecution of the war and the suppression of the rebellion, it is scarcely necessary to say, can receive no support or encouragement from the *American*.⁵⁰

Henry Winter Davis, the unopposed candidate for Congress in the Third District, said that the "great question" was not whether the Union should be preserved by arms; that was undisputed. The real question, now that Maryland was permanently consolidated with the United States, was emancipation, and the election on November 4 should decide that as a fundamental issue.⁵¹

The election offered a real test of strength between the two factions. The Unconditional Union group was conscious of the opposition's strength and early in the campaign opened headquarters in Baltimore. Conferences were held with the party's nominees for Congress—Creswell, Webster, Davis, Thomas and Holland, and a vigorous campaign was agreed upon. A series of meetings covering the entire State was planned. Two or more of the congressional candidates were to be present at each of the meetings.⁵²

The fight between Goldsborough and Maffit for State comptroller took an interesting turn. Each claimed Governor Bradford as his leading supporter. Maffit sent Bradford a clipping taken from the *Cecil Whig*, which he described as "a paper of the most radical abolition type," published at Elkton.⁵³ The clipping contained a list of prominent supporters of each candidate and at the head of the list of Goldsborough supporters was Governor Bradford's name. Maffit stated that Bradford was evidently unaware of the use of his name and would no doubt correct the mistake.⁵⁴

The *Kent News* of Chestertown charged that the *Baltimore American* was the organ of the Unconditional Union party, and the *American* felt called upon to explain its position.

⁵⁰ September 16, 1863.

⁵¹ *Appleton's*, III (1863), 623.

⁵² *Baltimore American*, September 24, 1863.

⁵³ Maffit to Bradford, September 23, 1863, Bradford MSS.

⁵⁴ Other men listed as Goldsborough supporters were Edwin H. Webster, Francis Thomas, H. Winter Davis, William B. Hill (Bradford's Secretary of State), Charles C. Fulton (editor of the *Baltimore American*), John A. J. Creswell, and "all the friends of the Government in the State." Among Maffit's supporters the following were listed: Charles B. Calvert, John B. Crisfield, George Vickers, James B. Ricaud, and a "few more Copperheads hardly worth notice." Actually, Bradford was sympathetic with the latter group, but in the ensuing election seems to have maintained openly a neutral position.

We would respectfully inform the editor of the *Kent News* that the *American* is not the organ of any party—does not desire to be the organ of any party—and never has had any aspirations for party leadership. With regard to the nominations now before the people, we care nothing for the means by which they were nominated, nor for the men either—our preference is for the sentiments that candidates may entertain and express. Our idea is to get rid of slavery in the State of Maryland at the earliest practicable moment that such a result can be obtained. Every Secessionist in the State will vote for Mr. Maffitt, Mr. Crisfield and Mr. Calvert, believing that they will do all in their power to procrastinate and retard Emancipation. These are reasons enough for us to oppose their election and we think reason enough for every true Union man in the State to do likewise.⁵⁵

This journal did not cease to proclaim Maryland's duty in the coming election. The State should not be "untrue to the glorious recollections of the past," should emphatically declare "her undying hatred to all that threatens the durability of the Union," continue to fight the battle for freedom, and "ring out another verdict to make the ears of traitors tingle who hear it."⁵⁶ The *The American* believed that every secessionist in the State would oppose Henry Winter Davis. He promised in his speech of acceptance to give his full support to the Lincoln administration and said he favored emancipation. He repudiated the side issue of "weak-kneed Union men," and stated that he would advocate the bill proposing an appropriation of \$10,000,000 for the indemnification of slaveholders.⁵⁷

Both the Democratic and conservative Union candidates feared that their chances would be greatly jeopardized by the presence of the Federal military machine on election day. Benjamin G. Harris, Democratic candidate for Congress from the Fifth District, petitioned Lincoln against such interference. The public, he said, was "in a state of uncertainty and excitement on the subject, which is likely to increase as the day of election approaches, and it would seem that it is entitled, under the circumstances, to some decided assurance from your Excellency."⁵⁸ Lincoln made no public reply to this letter as Harris had hoped he would.

⁵⁵ October 12, 1863.

⁵⁶ October 23, 1863.

⁵⁷ June 6, 1863.

⁵⁸ *National Intelligencer*, October 17, 1863; *Baltimore Daily Gazette*, October 17, 1863.

George Vickers, close adviser of Governor Bradford, informed the governor from Chestertown that the Unconditional Unionists were urging that voters of an "odious or objectionable character," should be required to take a test oath. Vickers insisted that such an oath was both unconstitutional and unnecessary since Maryland laws provide voting qualifications. Bradford should appeal to Lincoln, said Vickers, to prevent interference of any nature in the election, and he should also let the public know through the press that he opposed such interference.⁵⁹

Ex-Governor Hicks supported the conservative Unionists. He wrote to Bradford that they could not hope to please the "fanatics" and "political sycophants," among whom he included Henry Winter Davis, Judge Hugh Lennox Bond, John A. J. Creswell, and others. Hicks was surprised at Creswell's conversion to Unconditional Union doctrines, for he had earlier appeared in harmony with the conservatives. Hicks approved the use of Negroes in the Army, but opposed the method by which they were enlisted. As a slaveholder, he favored neither immediate nor uncompensated emancipation. He felt certain that Crisfield would win over Creswell if the military did not interfere.⁶⁰

A series of official communications between the Federal authorities and the Maryland civil authorities began on October 26, 1863, dealing with the November election. On that day Hicks, despite his recently quoted views to Bradford, wrote to General Schenck: "Our election is now near at hand, and I see no restriction placed upon the disloyal voters of our State; it does seem to me that if nothing else is done, there should be a stringent oath prepared, and the judges required to exact of all doubtful voters to take the oath, and they refusing shall not vote."⁶¹ Hicks's inconsistency, displayed in this letter and the one to Bradford, reminds one of his fence-sitting in 1861.

On October 26, Thomas Swann, chairman of the State Central Committee, wrote to President Lincoln declaring that the Union

⁵⁹ Vickers to Bradford, October 22, 1863, Bradford MSS. Vickers quoted the Provost Marshal of the Eastern Shore as saying that what could not be effected by "greenbacks," could be effected by the bayonet in the coming election. Vickers, as others, was beginning to speak of "Radical Republicans."

⁶⁰ Hicks to Bradford, October 20, 1863, Bradford MSS.

⁶¹ Hicks to Schenck, October 26, 1863. Bradford MSS. Schenck turned this letter over to Bradford.

men of Maryland had reason to believe that the election would be "attended with undue interference on the part of persons claiming to represent the best wishes of the government."⁶² Swann asked the President to reply to him in connection with this matter. Lincoln wrote on the following day:

Your letter, a copy of which is on the other half of this sheet, is received . . . there is no just ground for the suspicion you mention; and I am somewhat mortified that there could be any doubts of my views upon the point of your inquiry. I wish all loyal qualified voters in Maryland, and elsewhere to have the undisturbed privilege of voting at elections; and neither my authority nor my name can be properly used to the contrary.⁶³

The conservative Unionists, led by Governor Bradford, were not satisfied with this reply. Four days later the Governor reported to President Lincoln rumors that "detachments of soldiers are to be dispatched on Monday next to several of the counties of the State with a view of being present at their polls, on Wednesday next, the day of our State election." Bradford had also learned "that orders are to be issued from this military detachment on Monday, presenting certain restrictions, or qualifications in the right of suffrage—of what precise character I am not apprised—which the Judges of election will be expected to observe."⁶⁴ He could not believe that Lincoln knew of such orders for the President had told Reverdy Johnson, in his presence on October 22, that he opposed any interference. He, therefore, wrote to Johnson at once asking for "authentic information" on the matter.⁶⁵

Bradford understood that Lincoln had countermanded the proposed order of General Schenck, but the order had already been sent to every county in Maryland, and if countermanded, must be followed by special messengers to prevent its issuance in the

⁶² *Appleton's*, III (1863), 618; J. G. Nicolay and J. Hay, *Abraham Lincoln: A History*, VIII, 461; *Daily Gazette*, November 3, 1863; *Baltimore American*, November 2, 1863.

⁶³ *Appleton's*, III (1863), 618; Nicolay and Hay, *op. cit.*, p. 461; *Baltimore Daily Gazette*, November 3, 1863; *Baltimore American*, November 2, 1863.

⁶⁴ Bradford to Lincoln, October 31, 1863. Executive Letter Book (Md.), pp. 474-475. See also *Official Records*, 2nd Series, III, 967-968; Moore, *Rebellion Record*, VIII, Document No. 215, p. 602; *Baltimore American*, November 3, 1863.

⁶⁵ Bradford to Johnson, November 1, 1863. Johnson MSS (Library of Congress). See also B. C. Steiner, "Reverdy Johnson Papers in the Library of Congress," *Maryland Historical Magazine*, XV (1920), 43-44; Scharf, *History of Maryland*, III, pp. 560-570.

various parts of the State. Two of the five provost marshals under General Schenck's control in Maryland were candidates for political office, and if the order were not countermanded, Bradford believed they would use it to their advantage. If the President had countermanded Schenck's order, Bradford wanted to know at once, for he himself had a Proclamation to issue concerning the subject.

Before Lincoln replied to Bradford's letter, and before Johnson heard from Lincoln, General Schenck issued General Orders, No. 53, to which Bradford had referred. Secretary of War Stanton had called Schenck to Washington on November 1 to see the President, and was told to "issue no order in respect to the election until you see him."⁶⁶ Schenck replied to Stanton: "I will go to see the President by next train, 5 p. m. today. My order as to the election has already been issued. If it is revoked we lose the State. Can I see you first on arrival at Washington this evening?"⁶⁷

Schenck's General Orders No. 53 directed: (1) that provost-marshals and other military officers should arrest disloyal persons "found at, or hanging about, or approaching any poll or place of election . . ."; (2) that provost marshals and military officers should support judges of election "in requiring an oath of allegiance to the United States as the test of citizenship of any one whose vote may be challenged on the ground that he is not loyal . . .";⁶⁸ (3) that provost marshals and military officers should report to General Schenck all judges of the election who refused to require such an oath.⁶⁹ This order was directed chiefly against

⁶⁶ Stanton to Schenck, November 1, 1863, *Official Records*, 3rd Series, III, 968.

⁶⁷ Schenck to Stanton, November 1, 1863, *ibid.*, p. 968.

⁶⁸ The oath to be given was as follows: "I do solemnly swear that I will support, protect and defend the Constitution and Government of the United States, against all enemies, whether domestic or foreign; that I hereby pledge my allegiance, faith and loyalty to the same, any ordinance, resolution, or law, of any State Convention, or State Legislature, to the contrary notwithstanding; that I will at all times yield a hearty and willing obedience to the Constitution and Government, and will not, either directly or indirectly, do any act in hostility to the same, either by taking up arms against them, or aiding, abetting, or countenancing those in arms against them; that, without permission from the lawful authority, I will have no communication, direct or indirect, with the States in insurrection against the United States, or with either of them, or with any person or persons within said insurrectionary states; and that I will in all things deport myself as a good and loyal citizen of the United States. This I do in good faith, with full determination, pledge and purpose to keep this, my sworn obligation, and without any mental reservation or evasion whatsoever.

⁶⁹ *Official Record*, 1st series, XXIX, pt. 2, p. 394. See also *Baltimore American*,

the Eastern Shore where there had been less semblance of military authority than in other parts of the State. Martial law had been proclaimed on the Western Shore in June, 1863, but it had never been proclaimed on the Eastern Shore.⁷⁰

Lincoln interviewed Schenck on the subject as prearranged, and then replied to Bradford's letter. He supported Schenck and set forth the reciprocal rights and obligations of individual voters on the one hand, and the government authorities on the other.⁷¹ Lincoln said that he had given the matter careful attention and was assured by General Schenck that it was almost certain that violence would take place at the polls on election day unless provost guards prevented it. At some places Union voters would not vote or even run a ticket unless assured of protection. Lincoln said the test oath was essential if only loyal men were to vote. He did not think Bradford's assurance that nearly all the candidates were loyal was sufficient. "In this struggle for the nation's life, I cannot so confidently rely on those whose elections may have depended upon disloyal votes. Such men, when elected, may prove true; but such votes are given them in the expectation that they will prove false." He felt that Maryland, not having an oath of its own to require of disloyal voters, was to blame for the necessity of the military oath. He pointed out that keeping peace at the polls and preventing the outwardly disloyal from voting was not sufficient. All disloyal persons must be kept from voting. Lincoln caustically reminded Bradford that General Dix had aided Bradford's own election in 1861 by the very same tactics.

Lincoln was willing to compromise, however, if to do so would not interfere with principles he felt should be upheld. He, therefore, revoked the first of the three instructions in General Schenck's order, "not that it is wrong in principle, but because the military, being of necessity exclusive judges as to who shall be arrested, the provision is too liable to abuse."⁷² The other two instructions were allowed to stand.

November 2, 1863; *Appleton's*, III, 619; McPherson, *Political History of the Rebellion*, p. 309.

⁷⁰ Scharf, *History of Maryland*, III, 562.

⁷¹ Lincoln to Bradford, November 2, 1863, Executive Letter Book (Md.), pp. 475-476; *Official Records*, 3rd Series, III, 981-982; McPherson, *op. cit.*, p. 310; *Baltimore American*, November 5, 1863.

⁷² For the revoked provision Lincoln substituted the following: "That all provost-marshals and other military officers do prevent all disturbance and violence at or

Before receiving Lincoln's letter, Bradford had prepared a proclamation to the citizens of Maryland and "especially to the Judges of Election on the subject of Schenck's order." Bradford resented the invasion of state rights and the onus placed upon any candidate who was not endorsed by the military regime. He considered the order a violation of law and civil rights. He advised the judges of election to let their own judgment "determine the right to vote of any person offering himself for that purpose . . . undeterred by any orders to provost-marshals to report them to headquarters. He pointed out that for over two years all the traitors and Southern sympathizers in the State could not have controlled, had they voted, a single State department, or have jeopardized the success of the Union. He emphasized the unwavering loyalty of Maryland to the Union and protested against the "intervention with the privileges of the Ballot Box and . . . offensive . . . discrimination against the rights of a loyal State."⁷³ He urged the judges to uphold the State laws and Constitution and to exercise their duties conscientiously, and protested that the State would support them.

Bradford's proclamation was set up in type Monday, November 2, ready for publication in the *Baltimore American* on the next day. Late Monday afternoon, Bradford received Lincoln's letter revoking the first part of Schenck's order. Bradford, therefore, published a supplement with his proclamation in which he noted Lincoln's action but said he could "perceive no . . . change in the general principle of the order" that merited any revision of his proclamation.⁷⁴

General Schenck forbade the publication of Bradford's proclamation without his express permission,⁷⁵ and the *Baltimore American* withdrew the proclamation "regretting that such an order should have been received."⁷⁶ Schenck allowed the procla-

about the polls, whether offered by such persons as above described, or by any other person or persons whomsoever."

General Schenck accordingly issued a new order in line with the President's changes. McPherson, *op. cit.*, p. 311.

⁷³ The Proclamation is found in Augustus Williamson Bradford, "Journal," November 2, 1863; McPherson, *op. cit.*, pp. 309-310; *Baltimore American*, November 4, 1863; *Baltimore Daily Gazette*, November 4, 1863.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*

⁷⁵ *Official Records*, 3rd Series, III, 983. Schenck sent a similar order to the American Telegraph Company, forbidding Bradford's proclamation to be telegraphed to any point. *Ibid.*

⁷⁶ *Baltimore American*, November 4, 1863.

mation to be published on November 4 in connection with his second order to the election judges.⁷⁷ He also issued an address, to the "Loyal People of Maryland," in which he said that Bradford's proclamation was designed to produce collision between the military power and the voters at the polls. He had not, therefore, allowed the proclamation to be circulated on the Eastern Shore, and had forbidden steamboats to carry it across the Bay. Schenck resented Bradford's inference that his General Orders were prompted by other than patriotic motives or official duty. This charge, he said, was "unworthy of reply and unworthy of him [Bradford]." Schenck maintained that there were many rebels at large in the State, and that he had been besieged with letters from loyal citizens of Southern Maryland and the Eastern Shore asking that a test oath be required.⁷⁸

The Governor had given abundant evidence of his devotion to the Union cause. Now his authority was set aside and he was disparaged by what he considered illegal orders from a military commander. He was irked at this "undue interference" which implied a lack of confidence in his ability to supervise a fair election in Maryland. He thought the whole affair was an insult to the people of the State. Bradford furthermore resented Lincoln's observation that his own election in 1861 had been assured by military aid. He replied to this charge by asserting that the 15,000 majority vote he had received in 1861 could hardly be attributed to military support. Anyway, conditions in 1861 were quite different. At that time the State had a powerful secession element to contend with. General Dix's orders in 1861 had disfranchised only voters who had been or were in rebellion, or were aiding and abetting those in rebellion. Schenck's order, on the other hand, said Bradford, included everybody and even subjected election judges to military control.⁷⁹ He thought that Schenck would

⁷⁷ Schenck asked Lincoln on November 2 to send him copies of his correspondence with Bradford in order that he might know how to proceed in handling the Governor's proclamation. *Official Records*, 3rd Series, III, 982-983.

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, 3rd Series, III, 988-990; McPherson, *op. cit.*, p. 311; *Baltimore Sun*, November 4, 1863.

⁷⁹ Bradford to Lincoln, November 3, 1863. Executive Letter Book (Md.), pp. 476-479; *Baltimore Daily Gazette*, November 6, 1863; *Appleton's*, III (1863), 621-623.

General Dix upheld Bradford on these points. He said that military interference was not used for the same purpose in 1861 nor to the same extent as in 1863. He

regret his order since it created such widespread resentment in the State.⁸⁰

The *Baltimore American* upheld Schenck while the *Baltimore Sun* and other Baltimore papers remained quiet. The *American* thought that Bradford had "committed a grave error" if he desired to let men vote who rejoiced over Union defeats, and mourned over Federal victories. "The offer of the government to permit them to vote on taking an oath of allegiance is a concession to disloyalty that we would rather be disposed to criticize."⁸¹ Bradford, however, had much support for his proclamation. William H. Purnell, a conservative Union leader, wrote on November 4:

Your conduct in relation to the election entitles you to the commendation of all good Union men. Your course would give us a Union party upon a firm and enduring basis. I have conversed with many good Union men and exemplary citizens and a very large majority of them disapprove of the treatment which you have received at the hands of Maj. Gen. Schenck, and this will be the universal verdict of time.

I write this because I believe it is the duty of every citizen, however humble he may be, to bear testimony to the faithfulness and integrity of his rulers.⁸²

The conflict between Bradford and Schenck⁸³ led to irregularity in prescribing the oath to voters. At some polls all were required to take it, at others, none. The people in general, although chafing under such requirements, were more orderly than might have been expected at the polls. One writer says that "after a careful weighing of the evidence . . . President Lincoln and General Schenck used the military merely to keep disloyal citizens from voting, a procedure which may partly be justified as

had allowed people to vote their true sentiments so long as rebellious persons were excluded. Dix to Bradford, November 7 and December 10, 1863. Bradford MSS.

⁸⁰ Schenck was soon to resign his duties as Military Commander of the Middle Department. *Sun*, November 23, 1863; *Baltimore American*, December 7, 1863.

⁸¹ November 4, 1863.

⁸² William H. Purnell to Bradford, November 4, 1863, Bradford MSS.

⁸³ Despite their differences on this question, Schenck and Bradford had high personal regard for each other. Schenck insisted that he had received countless appeals from prominent citizens, including Hicks, to apply a test oath and aid at the election in keeping control. See letter of Charles Findlay to Bradford, November 7, 1863. Bradford MSS. Hicks later denied that he had petitioned Schenck for military aid in the election of 1863. Hicks to Bradford, August 10, 1863, Bradford MSS.

a legitimate political move to strengthen . . . the government in time of war.”⁸⁴ The *Baltimore American* upheld this view and agreed with Lincoln that since Maryland had provided “no remedy for its protection against the acts of treason as lately displayed at the polls,” it had been necessary for the general government to do so.⁸⁵ General Schenck was not directly responsible for the election outrages, but he did contribute to them by his open espousal of the Unconditional Union ticket. He himself made political speeches and allowed his subordinates to do the same.⁸⁶

A situation that caused more resentment than the General Orders of General Schenck developed when Lieutenant-Colonel C. C. Tevis issued an order at Chestertown urging all loyal voters to vote the “whole Government Ticket, upon the platform adopted by the Union League Convention [the Unconditional Union group]. None other is recognized by the Federal authorities as loyal and worthy of the support of any one who desires the peace and restoration of this Union.”⁸⁷ This brazen order was suppressed by General Schenck and Colonel Tevis was placed under arrest. On November 6 he issued a statement explaining his action and requesting release. The request was granted, presumably without a trial, three days later by Schenck who explained that Tevis appeared “to have acted himself in good faith and from a sense of duty,” but was misled by Captain John Frazier, Provost Marshal of the First Congressional District. Frazier was himself a candidate for Clerk of Court in Kent County, and thus one of the “Government Ticket.” Schenck explained that Tevis and Frazier, prompted by “indiscreet or bad advisers,” had overstepped their powers.⁸⁸

Military authorities used various methods to control the polls throughout the State. On the Eastern Shore the tickets supporting

⁸⁴ W. S. Myers, *Maryland Constitution of 1864* (1901), p. 28.

⁸⁵ November 23, 1863.

⁸⁶ *Sun*, August 17, October 29, 1865; *Baltimore American*, October 9, 15, 16, 19, 23, 29, 1863.

⁸⁷ *Maryland House and Senate Documents* (1864), Documents Accompanying the Governor's Message. See also McPherson, *op. cit.*, p. 311. Governor Bradford, in explanation of his trouble with Schenck, prepared for the public a long statement, never issued, in which he said that as soon as Tevis issued his order all the printers in the vicinity were arrested in order that no one could print a reply to it. Bradford MSS. The “Government Ticket” was printed on yellow paper to distinguish it from the others.

⁸⁸ McPherson, *op. cit.*, p. 311; *Baltimore American*, November 6, 10, 1863.

Crisfield were not allowed at all; at other places the army actively supported candidates for local office. General Lockwood, for instance, who was in charge of Somerset County and at the same time an Unconditional Union candidate for sheriff, announced that anyone who voted for him would not be molested. The Democrats shrewdly tricked him, however, by not placing his name on the ballot after promising to do so. At Princess Anne, in the same county, only one citizen was allowed to vote, the election judges were arrested and the polls closed. The judges were soon released, but voting was not resumed.⁸⁹ Military interference was more obnoxious in Kent County than anywhere else. Kent was a small county but had contributed more than its share of the State's quota of volunteers and drafted men. Nevertheless, on Monday, November 2, Provost Marshal Frazier arrested some of the leading men of the county, including James B. Ricaud, Union candidate for the State Senate; Jesse K. Hines, Union nominee for Clerk of Court and therefore Frazier's opponent; Colonel Edward Wilkens; Colonel S. W. Spencer, called by Bradford one of the most loyal Union men on the Eastern Shore; Charles Stanley, Thomas Baker, David A. Benjamin, George W. T. Perkins, John T. Dodd, James H. Plummer, and William B. Usilton. George Vickers and George B. Wescott, the latter a Union candidate for the House of Delegates, were slated for arrest, but escaped because they were in Baltimore at the time protesting to General Schenck of military abuses in Kent County. The arrested men were taken to Schenck's headquarters in Baltimore on the steamer *Nellie Pentz*. Schenck was surprised to see so many prisoners, stating that only a few arrests had been ordered for interference with Negro enlistment in Kent County.⁹⁰ He soon released them and they returned to Chestertown on Wednesday morning. But Frazier's purpose had been served. The men had been taken away at a time when their influence, as candidates or political leaders, could have been exercised. Their arrests also intimidated many of their friends who either voted for the Unconditional Union candidates or abstained from voting.⁹¹ Many other outrages were

⁸⁹ *Maryland House and Senate Documents* (1864), Doc. A.

⁹⁰ See Bradford's unpublished account of this affair. Bradford MSS. See also the account in the *Chestertown News*, leading organ of the Unionists in Kent County. It was reprinted in the *Sun*, November 9, 1863.

⁹¹ Frazier was defeated by Hines by 800 votes for Clerk of the Court, but the

perpetrated on the Eastern Shore and cases were reported in other parts of the State. None, however, were on so large a scale or conducted with such bold effrontery as those on the Eastern Shore, where General Schenck's original order and not Lincoln's modification was enforced.⁹²

Great excitement prevailed on election day, especially in the First and Fifth Congressional Districts where Unconditional Union candidates were opposed for Congress. In the First District there was a dog fight between the Union incumbent, John W. Crisfield, and the Unconditional Unionist, John A. J. Creswell. In the Fifth District John G. Holland, the Unconditional Unionist, was opposed by Charles B. Calvert, the Union incumbent, and Benjamin G. Harris, the Democratic candidate.

Election day passed off quietly in Baltimore City, however. The gatherings at the voting places were generally smaller than at preceding elections. Military and police orders were posted prominently at precinct polls, but military guards were reported to have abstained from much interference with voters. Throughout the entire day and night drinking houses were kept closed.⁹³ The *Baltimore American* reported that "Tickets of all kinds were in abundance at the polls, and all loyal men voted their sentiments freely, so far as the choice of candidates was concerned."⁹⁴

The Unconditional Union ticket scored an overwhelming victory on November 4. Goldsborough defeated Maffit for comptroller by a vote of 36,360 to 15,984, crushing him in Baltimore by a count of 10,545 to 367. The *Baltimore American* said that "Mr. Maffit, the representative of the slave-holding interest, was scarcely regarded as a candidate in the contest."⁹⁵ The party candidates for the legislature were selected chiefly on their loyalty to the Union and their attitude toward emancipation. The results gave the Unionist-Emancipation party absolute control of the

rest of the "Government Ticket" was elected. *Sun*, November 9, 1863, *Maryland House and Senate Documents* (1864), Doc. A.

⁹² See letter of George Vickers to Bradford, November 8, 1863, describing outrages in Queen Anne's County. Executive Letter Book, pp. 485-487; *Official Records*, 2nd Series, VI, 584, 603, 607. A force of cavalry was sent to each Eastern Shore county to be used at the polls.

⁹³ *Sun*, November 5, 1863.

⁹⁴ November 5, 1863.

⁹⁵ *Ibid.*; *Appleton's*, III, 623, gives a slightly different vote. Goldsborough's majority was still 10,000 less than Bradford's in 1861.

legislature.⁹⁶ And, while the legislature was forbidden by the Constitution of 1851 to interfere with slavery, that body was expected to authorize a constitutional convention to act upon the question.

In the Congressional elections the Unconditional Unionist candidates were victorious in the first four districts. Webster, Davis, and Thomas were unopposed,⁹⁷ and Creswell polled a vote of 6,742 to 5,482 for Crisfield, the incumbent and a conservative Unionist. Benjamin G. Harris was elected to Congress from the Fifth District by a vote of 4,939. Holland, his Unconditional Union opponent, received 3,352 votes and Calvert, Conservative Unionist, 2,237.⁹⁸ The combined Unconditional Union and Union vote was only about half the total vote of the presidential election in 1860.⁹⁹ This drop was obviously due to the lack of opposition for many Union candidates and to the fact that many Southern sympathizers had either been prevented from voting or had left the State. It is estimated that one-third of those qualified to vote failed to do so in many districts.¹⁰⁰ Except on the Eastern Shore the Union majorities were large enough to give credence to the claim that the State was Unconditionally Unionist.

Governor Bradford, commenting upon the election in his message to the legislature, said:

. . . Unless it be a fallacy to suppose that any rights whatever remain to such a State, or that any line whatever marks the limit of Federal power, a bolder stride across that line that power never made even in a Rebel State than it did here on the fourth of last November.

A part of the Army which a generous people had supplied for a very different purpose, was on that day engaged in stifling the freedom of

⁹⁶ Results of the 1863 election:

Party Affiliation	Senate	House of Delegates
Union and Emancipationists.....	10	47
Union, pledged to convention.....	2	5
Union, unpledged.....	6 *	4
Democrats and Slavery.....	3	18
	<hr/> 21	<hr/> 74

* Most of the six unpledged Union members were expected to vote for a convention.

⁹⁷ Webster was given a vote of 7,736, Davis 6,200, and Thomas 13,462.

⁹⁸ *Appleton's*, III, 623.

⁹⁹ Maffit and Goldsborough together polled a vote of 52,244, while the vote of all Maryland in 1860 was 92,505.

¹⁰⁰ *Maryland House Documents* (1864), Doc. A. See also George Vickers to Bradford, November 9, 1863, Bradford MSS.

election in a faithful State, intimidating its sworn officers, violating the constitutional rights of its loyal citizens and obstructing the usual channels of communication between them and their Executive.¹⁰¹

It is doubtful if Creswell could have defeated Crisfield without military support, and Crisfield made plans at once to contest the election. He sought the help of Governor Bradford, asking him not to commission Creswell as Congressman so long as his seat was contested.¹⁰² Bradford, however, certified on November 25 that Creswell had been elected as a Representative from the First District. Actually Bradford was sympathetic to Crisfield's position but did not think he had the right to go behind the election returns.¹⁰³ Creswell was under heavy fire from the conservative Union men, especially Reverdy Johnson. Judge Hugh L. Bond wrote to Creswell on January 19, 1864: "You must do something to answer Johnson's attacks. It will never do to let us labor under this continued fire. Go at him with the largest bore you have, endorse everything done (in the election) and the people will sustain you. . . . If you don't fight we are ruined."¹⁰⁴ Bond insisted that Creswell support the Lincoln administration's policy of emancipation in order that he might be sustained by the Unionists and the Federal authorities.

. . . This rule of action, once established, will annihilate the Copper Head party, and neutralize nine tenths of the most vindictive Rebels. At first Copper Heads were opposed to negro enlistments; this . . . has at last with them subsided. . . . Rebels in Maryland confess they are willing for their government to use their slaves in the Army, but before they can be pacified entirely, the government must take out the free negroes, and the remaining useless material of women and children.

Now is clear that Emancipation and Colonization will unite Copperheads with administration men, and will bring the Rebels to an alliance with us, and thus break down all potent opposition to our great administrative party.

¹⁰¹ *Maryland House Documents* (1864), Doc. A.

¹⁰² Crisfield to Bradford, November 14, 30, 1863, Bradford MSS.

¹⁰³ See Crisfield to Bradford, December 22, 1863, in which he thanks him for his support and praises his proclamation of November 2. Bradford MSS. Bradford was advised by Reverdy Johnson that his duties were merely ministerial and that the House of Delegates must consider the merits of Crisfield's case. *Maryland Constitution of 1864*, p. 29.

John R. Kerr, writing to Bradford on November 25, 1863, enclosed a clipping from the *Philadelphia Inquirer*, headed: "The Maryland Election, A Political Rumor," which discussed the merits of the contested elections, Bradford MSS.

¹⁰⁴ Bond to Creswell, January 19, 1864. Creswell MSS. (L. of C.), Vol. 4, 748-9.

Let our motto be emancipation and colonization, a separation of the Races, the establishment of a colored nationality, and then we are at peace, at once and forever.¹⁰⁵

The legislature of 1864 spent much time taking testimony and considering evidence in connection with contested elections. Defeated candidates from the Eastern Shore and Southern Maryland counties were loath to acknowledge their defeats because of the part the Federal military force played in bringing them about. Governor Bradford was petitioned on all sides to help these disappointed candidates, who were conservative Unionists or Democrats. Bradford regretted the situation but said he was powerless. The House of Delegates was composed primarily of Unconditional Unionists, and gave no aid to the contestants.¹⁰⁶

The Unionists were occupied in the latter days of 1863 and the early months of 1864 in making plans for the State convention which the legislature was expected to authorize. The conservative State Central Committee met on December 16 and indicated its acceptance of the results of the 1863 election by passing resolutions favoring such a convention.¹⁰⁷ The convention was also the main topic of interest at the Unconditional Union meeting held in Baltimore on January 21. The Unconditional Unionists also made plans for participation in a National Unconditional Union Convention.¹⁰⁸

In his message to the legislature Governor Bradford recommended the calling of a convention to revise the constitution with particular reference to slavery. In accordance therewith the legislature passed an act for "taking the sense of the people of Maryland upon the expediency of calling a convention to frame a new constitution and form of government for the State."¹⁰⁹ The people approved the call and a convention met at Annapolis on April 27.¹¹⁰ A new constitution was drawn up, the main provision

¹⁰⁵ Letter of John Frazier and other members of the Board of Enrollment for the First District of Maryland, to Creswell, January 20, 1864, Creswell MSS., IV, 756-757.

¹⁰⁶ *Maryland House Documents* (1864), Doc. A and others.

¹⁰⁷ *Sun*, December 17, 1863. The resolutions were prepared by Thomas Swann and John P. Kennedy.

¹⁰⁸ *Sun*, January 23, 1864.

¹⁰⁹ *Laws of Maryland* (1864), Chapter 5, pp. 7-12.

¹¹⁰ Myers, *Maryland Constitution of 1864*, presents a full description of the convention proceedings. For the new constitution see F. N. Thorpe, *Federal and State Constitutions* (1909), III, 1741-1779.

of which freed all slaves in Maryland, effective November 1, 1864. Other provisions increased the governor's salary and changed his tenure from three to four years. Section 47 directed the legislature to require by law that the following take the oath of allegiance to the United States: presidents, directors, trustees, or agents of corporations chartered by Maryland; teachers, superintendents of public schools or other institutions of learning; attorneys at law; and jurors. This oath was severely restrictive and was aimed at Southern sympathizers. All who refused to take the oath were disfranchised and barred from office. Another section of the constitution stipulated that laws should be passed for the registration of election officials, for the disfranchisement of certain persons and for the disqualification of others from holding office.

(To be continued.)

THE CALVERT-STIER CORRESPONDENCE

Edited by WILLIAM D. HOYT, JR.

(Continued from Volume XXXVIII, page 140, June, 1943)

The year 1809 opened a new chapter in the correspondence between Rosalie Stier Calvert, in Maryland, and her brother Jean Charles Stier, in Belgium.* Both writers started numbering their letters, in order to be able to know certainly whether their epistles were received. This was a practice often followed in the nineteenth century, especially when the correspondents were located far from each other. In the case of the Calvert-Stier communications, it is apparent that several letters from the sister in America did not reach their destination.

The first letter in the new series contains some interesting comments on the state of affairs in the United States immediately after James Madison became president. The characterization of Madison as "one of these wavering weak characters" is significant because that member of the so-called "Virginia dynasty" has come down in history as a man who did not take a strong stand in his handling of relations with England prior to the outbreak of the War of 1812. The Gilbert Stuart portraits of the Calvert family mentioned are those reproduced with the previous instalment of these letters and are now owned by Mrs. T. Morris Murray.

[Rosalie S. Calvert to Jean Charles Stier, Riversdale, April 1, 1809]

No. 1. Like you, dear Brother, I begin today to number my letters—a precaution we should have taken a long time ago. . . . Alas, we are only too well convinced that this government and the Federal Union cannot exist without a respectable navy, but our wretched President is, I fear, one of those wavering weak characters and although in reality an honest man, he will do as much harm as his predecessors. This country has reached a very alarming crisis. Torn by two parties, the eastern States jealous of the South; Congress enacting laws she is unable to enforce, and obliged to retract them afterwards only to substitute equally bad ones—our flag insulted at the same time by England and France, and all this the result of the administration of that wretched Jefferson.

* Translations of the letters have been deposited with the Maryland Historical Society by their owner, Mrs. Henry J. Bowdoin, of Elkridge, Md., a great-granddaughter of Rosalie Stier.

. . . The painter Stuart is in Boston at this time. He painted my portrait and one of my husband three years ago. The resemblance is good but I am not content with mine, or I should have sent it to you, as it was for that I ordered it. I am entirely of your opinion as to the bringing up of children. Chance has undoubtedly much influence over their inclinations, and a clear-sighted and watchful mother can be most useful to them in keeping her eye on all their actions, and without antagonizing them, she can imperceptibly instruct them how to think and act rightly. Observing and studying their inclinations she may choose the career likely to make them most happy, for one lad brought up to be a lawyer might have been a second Linnaeus, while another following the plow murmurs over to himself dreamily the verse he read in the last almanac. I am so much obliged to you for your offer to introduce George to your world when he shall have reached the suitable age. I think several colleges north of Philadelphia are excellent; among others Princeton, Cambridge, etc. But I regret infinitely the lack of young girls' schools. That is beginning to worry me so much. Caroline is now nine years of age, and I know of no good school to which I could send her. I do not like the young girls' manners here. . . .

Five months later, Rosalie comments on the unrest then current in the country, applying it to her own particular situation. The Calverts were unable to sell their crops and so could not afford to hire a tutor for the children. The result was that Mrs. Calvert herself did the teaching, and it bored and confused her.

[Rosalie S. Calvert to Jean Charles Stier, Riversdale, September 1, 1809]

. . . What unexpected news we are receiving from the banks of the Danube and what a formidable fleet they are arming in England, and what—but I think it is better for us not to talk about politics at the distance we are from each other. One never knows what changes will have taken place before the three months' old letter arrives. Let us talk of ourselves. You will hardly believe in the light of my delay in replying that I re-read your letters very often and each time with renewed pleasure. How I envy you who are able to divert yourself so and turn your attention to your friends, while I am absorbed in business, in household squabbles, the worry of teaching children, etc., etc. All these vexations are doubled by the commercial obstacles which prevent our selling our harvests and consequently leave us without income. I was just about to engage a tutor who was quite what I wanted for my children, but I must put it off still for these reasons and continue to teach them myself, which not only bores me insufferably but by confining me still more closely to the house is injurious to my health, and confuses my brain so that I reason falsely often and have not good common sense. Have you not remarked that schoolmasters are always stupid people, like wanderers from another world or from a dead and gone century? . . .

That Rosalie Stier Calvert still retained fond feelings for her native land is evident from her remarks concerning the English invasion of the Low Countries. At the same time, she was an active participant in the party struggles in Maryland, at least once providing an ox for a campaign feast. She appreciated, too, the beauties of the American autumn.

[Rosalie S. Calvert to Jean Charles Stier, Riversdale, October 30, 1809]

. . . Some time ago the public papers announced that the English were going to attack the Island of Walcheren at the mouth of the Scheldt. That was very dreadful for me and today I see that an attack on Fort Lille is planned and perhaps on Anvers itself. Imagine what anxieties that is causing me, *cher ami*. I had hoped that amidst the extreme disorder prevailing over all Europe that town which holds all that is dear to me would be far enough from the theatre of the war to be out of danger. Assuredly you will not remain there! But so long a time must go by before I can have tidings of you. Then this immense horde of troops sent for the defence must be a great tax on our poor country and will your country estates not suffer? I wish you had all remained here where we shall be safe at least as long as England keeps her supremacy at sea. However we have our bickerings here too. The two parties (Democrats and Federalists) grow more eager from day to day to know who will win. This year there will be a small majority against us in the Maryland Legislature. However we [the Federalists] triumphed in our county. My brother-in-law Edward C.,²⁶ being the most popular man, was obliged to enter the lists again for the public good and was elected as well as your old friend and our neighbor John C. Herbert,²⁷ who I suppose you know, married Miss Snowden, an heiress. My husband took a very active part in this election. It becomes more and more important for landed owners. It is absolutely necessary that we should smother party feuds which are formed here, or they would destroy us in the end. The other day you might have heard me giving orders for an entire ox to be roasted for the support of our cause. I hope and believe that we shall succeed still better next year.

You ask me, dear Brother, if Mr. C. is still as gay as when you knew him. I think not. He has generally more to attend to than he can possibly manage, and that is not conducive to gayety. He is always as affectionate and indulgent to me as he was. My four children are a boundless source of happiness to me. I anticipate great satisfaction from George, who promises well. Caroline is the prettiest girl of her age I have ever seen and it is the opinion of all who see her as well. She has not so easy

²⁶ Edward Henry Calvert (1766-1846) was a member of the House of Delegates for one term. He married Elizabeth Biscoe and was a vestryman of St. Paul's Parish, Prince George's County.

²⁷ John Carlyle Herbert (1757-1846) served several terms before and after 1809. He married Mary Snowden of "Montpelier" and lived at "Walnut Grange," not far from the Calverts.

a character to govern as her brother's but as she has a good understanding and is capable of deep affection and sensibility, I hope to make her a very good girl with care. . . .

Do you still paint? I would like to send you a copy of the fine view I see from my window while I am writing. There is such a great variety of autumn foliage in one of the clumps of trees on the right, a very round maple tree seems gilded, beside it a hickory is entirely of deep red and a young magnolia of tender green, while a half dozen other trees of different tints are reflected in the water. It is the loveliest season in America.

The next letter, penned in the summer of 1810, describes in some detail the development of the region around the Capital City. Roads and bridges were under construction, and the comforts of life were easy to obtain, but Rosalie regrets the simplicity which had existed before the means of quick communication were introduced.

[Rosalie S. Calvert to Jean Charles Stier, Riversdale, July 23, 1810]

. . . Your sermon on the employment of time and the faults we inherit is indeed excellent, and I said Amen with a sigh. I am going to take your advice and do nothing more myself. Then I shall lose my reputation as one of the best housekeepers of Maryland, but I shall console myself by imagining I deserve it much more. I have had a tutor for my children for some time which is a great comfort, but *en revanche*, I have lost my nurse and cannot find a suitable new one. Here is my little Henry who requires all my care, but he is so good and dear that I cannot do enough for him. My husband does not agree with you, and says he cannot have anything done properly unless he looks after it himself, and I must allow that this is the last country in which to find a good agent. He has many duties, above all when we have workmen; then he is Director of the Bank of Washington, which takes a day every week; director of a manufacturing company in Georgetown, and principal agent of a road to be made between this place and Washington. Then he has to direct the work of our different plantations, one of which is eighteen miles from here, which takes a day and a half every fortnight. You have no idea how this country has improved since you left. We have all the luxury of Europe and have lost that simplicity which was worth far more. In the towns the change is astonishing. An excellent bridge has been made over the Potomac facing the Capitol, which shortens considerably the distance to Alexandria. That town does not prosper. Still the Bank gave a dividend this month of half a cent % more than last month.

The famous Stier collection of paintings packed away in the stable at "Riversdale," was the subject of comment by Rosalie to her brother. It appears that sale of the pictures was considered

several years before any definite action was taken.²⁸ It is interesting to note that, although the Calverts had lived at "Riversdale"

²⁸ The history of the Stier collection is told in Rembrandt Peale's "Reminiscences," published in *The Crayon* for September 19, 1855:

THE STIER GALLERY

In the notes of Sir Joseph Reynolds' journey through Belgium and Holland, he says, "Mr. Havern (Antwerp) has an admirable portrait by Rubens, known by the name of the *Chapeau de Paille*, from having on her head a hat and feathers, airily put on; it has wonderful transparency of color, as if seen in the open air; it is upon the whole a very striking portrait, but her breasts are as ill drawn, as they are finely colored." This short notice was sufficient to give the picture a widespread celebrity. It was afterwards purchased by Mr. Stier, an Antwerp banker, who having married a lady *lineally* descended from Rubens, possessed the pictures which decorated the mansion of that great artist. He also bought, from the cabinet of Mr. Peters, Rubens' *Stable Scene*, with the Prodigal Son and the Roman Charity, by the same artist; of which Reynolds says it is "in his very best manner. The woman who is suckling her father, is one of his most beautiful heads, and it has likewise great expression."

Travellers, subsequent to Sir Joshua, speak of Mr. Stier's Gallery as consisting of many excellent pictures. With his entire collection, he fled from the revolutionary broils of Belgium, and sought refuge and safety to his wealth in America. This collection remained *unboxed* at his residence during his long sojourn in Philadelphia, then but a young Athens in the Arts! He afterwards resided in Annapolis, where his chief enjoyment appeared to be the cultivation of gorgeous beds of tulips, according to the Holland taste.

I spent the winter of 1799 in that city, and Mr. Stier was so well pleased with my portraits that he engaged me to paint him, never having honored any other artist with that commission. As my painting room was small, he proposed to sit at his own house, as he wished to place before me three excellent portraits by Titian, Rubens and Vandyke, as objects of inspiration for a young artist.—a proposition which I received with great pleasure. As I was preparing my materials for the occasion, I was surprised by a visit from his son with a message "requesting that I would not *copy* any of the portraits which were to be placed before me." To this, I replied, "in that case I certainly shall not ask him." "But said the son, (mistaking my meaning) "you must promise that you will *not* copy them." I informed him that no human power could copy them by the force of memory, and as I could not *ask* him to lend them, I certainly should not make any attempt to imitate them—but hoped to make his father's portrait the better under their influence. The portraits were excellent, especially a magnificent head of Rubens in his old age, painted by Vandyke—the finest portrait by that artist that I ever saw.

The old gentleman was so well pleased with the effort I made that he volunteered to show me the greater part of his collection—and on the appointed evening, by the imperfect light of a single candle, and both of us shivering with cold, he carefully displayed to me his hoarded treasures. It was in vain I afterwards tried to induce him to show his entire collection to me in company with Chancellor Hanson, the only person in Annapolis of reputed taste in the Fine Arts.

Mr. Stier's only daughter—an elegant woman—was soon after married to Mr. Calvert of Bladensburg, who ten years after this called on me in Baltimore, with an open letter from his father-in-law in Antwerp, informing him that he now considered the country relieved from the dangers of war, and stipulating that if Mr. Calvert chose to retain the pictures, he was at liberty to do so, at a valuation of seventy thousand dollars; if not, on receipt of the pictures he would remit his daughter that sum. Mr. Calvert asked me if he ought to keep them. My answer, which I gave with much feeling, was, that if he retained them in our country, the Arts and the artists would be greatly his debtors; but my impression was, that if offered for sale, they would not bring him ten thousand dollars. He decided to

for approximately nine years, the title was still partly in the name of the brother who had returned to Europe.

[Rosalie S. Calvert to Jean Charles Stier, Riversdale, August 1810]

. . . You ask if I often look at the pictures. It would be a great diversion for me undoubtedly, but if they were unpacked a number of curious, troublesome people would be drawn here, for the reputation of these pictures is extreme from one end of America to the other, and then I am afraid of their getting spoiled. One can never be sure that some time the doorkey might not be forgotten in the lock. So they are still in the cases in which you packed them, with the exception of a dozen small ones, which were in the hall at Annapolis and which Papa packed separately. We have hung them in the drawing room, which is always shut up unless we give large dinners and that does not often happen. The cases are kept in the coach house, in which, where it is very high pitched, I had a platform made over the carriages where they are safe from any accident, and north of the house. It seems to me, however, a great shame to keep such a collection without deriving any benefit from it. Papa does not want it, I believe, nor does any other member of the family apparently. Would it not be better to send them to England, where you could sell them at a good price? I often see advertisements of sales of pictures in the London gazettes, and several days ago I read of one where a Rembrandt was sold for £5,000 sterling, two others for £3,000 and many others for lesser sums, but all for very high prices.

send them to Antwerp—before doing which I urged him to unpack the pictures and permit our artists and amateurs to see the collection. "Impossible!" replied Mr. Calvert; "Should I do so, Mr. Stier would disinherit his daughter!" But, when I represented the danger in which the pictures probably were, by damp and mice, and that it was his duty to *see* them returned in a *safe* condition, he finally consented, and agreed with me, that they should be opened and repacked, under the direction of Mr. King, artist of Washington; and whilst spread out to dry, they might then be seen as I desired. The privilege was soon made known, and for two weeks his mansion at Bladensburg was the hospitable rendezvous of numerous visitors of taste and education, from the different cities. Besides many Flemish paintings, the portraits I have mentioned, whole length by Vandyke, there were by Rubens, the Roman Daughter, the Stable Scene, with the Prodigal Son, and the renowned Chapeau de Paille—or rather Chapeau d'Espagne." It was a new and pleasant sight to witness such an animated assemblage of artists and amateurs—members of Congress from the different States, merchants, lawyers, and country gentlemen—all engaged in discussing the merits of pictures and painters.

Some years after this a portion of the collection was to be sold at Antwerp, and two gentlemen of London (Mr. Smith, the celebrated picture dealer, was one of them) attended the sale, determined to buy the Chapeau, which they did for thirty-six thousand florins. They were censured by their friends for giving such an exorbitant price—but they showed their better knowledge, by exhibiting the picture, with the prospectus for an engraving of it. I have understood that the exhibition refunded the cost of the picture, and the beautiful mezzotint by Cozens was sufficiently remunerative. An excellent copy of it I have seen in the possession of Mr. Rollins of Boston—painted for him with the consent of Sir Robert Peel, who became the purchaser of the picture—but at what price I could never learn.

[Rosalie S. Calvert to Jean Charles Stier, November 1810]

. . . I should be greatly obliged if you would send me a deed for the land of Riversdale by the first person who comes over to us. Several years ago Papa sent me one, but it would not be valid here. In order to obviate the possibility of a mistake I will write in the English form exactly how it should be made out:

"Copy exactly William Stuart's deed to Jean Charles Stier but insert the name of Jean Charles Stier in the place of William Stuart's, and the name Rosalie Eugenia Stier in the place of J. C. Stier. This deed must be signed by Jean Charles Stier before two witnesses and in the presence of one person coming to America and will deliver it to R. E. Calvert who will get a judge of the court to take the acknowledgment of the person who brings it that he saw Jean Charles Stier sign it—J. C. Stier's wife making the same relinquishment before witnesses as in the other deed."

I am sorry to give you so much trouble, but I hope you will do it soon for me. As opportunities so rarely occur of sending the deed by a person who comes from Antwerp to America, it is important not to neglect one. We have gone to great expense over Riversdale and shall be obliged to continue doing so; therefore it is important for me to have an indisputably clear title.

Rosalie's interest in the course of events as the war with England came nearer is reflected by her absorption with public affairs during 1811. Her comments are somewhat prophetic, for she mentions the pro-British sentiment in New England which led finally to the abortive Hartford Convention.

[Rosalie S. Calvert to Jean Charles Stier, April, 1811]

. . . I have bought shares in the Bank of Washington with part of your January dividends, as you will see by the enclosed accounts. I believe this Bank to be one of the best there are, but you must tell me whenever possible how you wish me to act. I am very much afraid that we shall have a revolution here shortly and in that event all the banks as well as the national bonds will be very precarious. A voyage here would be nothing for you and would interest your wife, so come and see what we are doing. You will be astonished with the changes such a few years have wrought in customs as well as in breeding etc. We have advanced a whole century in five years' time. . . .

Since your last letter you have seen Mr. Barlow,²⁹ our Ambassador who intended to go to Antwerp. He will have given you undoubtedly long accounts of this country and of the great improvements which have been made during the last few years. You know he is of the party in power, so as to the government—But if he is sincere he can notwith-

²⁹ Joel Barlow (1754-1812) was appointed Minister to France in 1811 and directed to try to obtain from Napoleon better treatment of American commerce. He followed the Emperor to Poland, but fell ill and died there without having the interview which was the purpose of his trip.

standing give you many details about everything concerning America and especially financial matters does he understand very well. The charter for the Bank of North America will expire in three years and it is undecided whether it will be renewed. . . . You cannot conceive to what extent everything is in confusion in this country. The most clear-sighted people are bewildered. I fear it will end badly, for we are going from bad to worse.

[Rosalie S. Calvert to Jean Charles Stier, Riversdale, July 15, 1811]

. . . I cannot conceal from you that my fears as to the stability of our constitution augment every moment. I foresee an inevitable revolution and I fear its near approach. Do not think these idle crochets, the best informed and most weighty people are of my opinion, and it is that of the most prominent Senators and Members of Congress. A war with England which our government will provoke will be the prelude, and it is to be anticipated that the Eastern States will put themselves under the protection of that power. What will then become of the Southern States? They will either be torn asunder by anarchy or fall prey to Napoleon. In whatever way one regards the situation it presents an alarming aspect. Any revolution would annul the public debt; but I fear even if it were possible for the present state of affairs to continue, that even then, the debt would be endangered, for the party governing at present would not hesitate to pass the sponge over all their debts. But I will cease to act as ill-foreboding prophet!

The conflict with England had broken into actual warfare when Rosalie wrote her next letters to her brother, and she remarks that the blockade of American ports made outside communication nearly impossible. Sandwiched between piquant observations on the war are items of family news which trace the growth of the young Calverts. Of especial interest are the comments on financial matters apparently quite unusual for a matron of the period, but not so strange when it is remembered that Rosalie came of a family of merchants and was herself manager of her brother's money in America.

[Rosalie S. Calvert to Jean Charles Stier, Riversdale, February 24, 1813]

. . . At this time it is nearly impossible to send letters, and I begin this one without the least hope of being able to forward it for a long time. A fleet of two English ships of 74 cannon, and six frigates close the entry to the Chesapeake and Delaware and do not allow the smallest boat to pass. Meanwhile the country is torn asunder by numerous factions and in Congress there is open talk of dissolving the union of the States. In short I do not know how it will all end. . . . The moderation of the English is surprising. We have already taken three of their frigates, there is nothing to prevent their reducing all our ports to ashes (for there

is no one to defend them) and still they are content to blockade us. I will send you some clippings from our gazettes on the authenticity of which you may rely and which will give you some idea of our situation.

I do not know if I wrote to you that my youngest is a girl. She came into the world March 6th 1812 and is named after our dear departed mother, Marie Louise. She is very sweet, has begun to walk and is very healthy. Eugenie, aged six and a half, is the most lovable child imaginable. If I had the power of the old fairies I could find nothing to add to her person or to her character. George and Caroline have been in Philadelphia at French Schools since last November. It is very expensive for us, over \$1,000; but I think one can give nothing better to one's children than a good education, and I would rather economize on everything else but that. I had tried two different tutors during two years, who did not satisfy me. Besides, they could not learn French nor dancing nor drawing here. They will return for one month vacation next September, and then we can tell what progress they have made, and whether it is desirable to keep them there. Recently I have resumed the amusing occupation of school mistress for Eugenie and Charles.³⁰ This makes me waste much time and patience. I go out very seldom and see very few people, which gives me leisure to be constantly with my children, and finally I believe I shall become a child myself!

[April 11, 1813]

. . . I send to Papa today some interesting extracts from our gazettes. I do not think our president was sincere in sending a minister to Russia; perhaps it was only a ruse to obtain money. The loan which was opened in the beginning of March (giving 6% and an annuity for 13 years of 1% had only a very moderate sum subscribed, because it was evident that if the war kept on the bonds would decrease to nothing. At present the Secretary of the Treasury has just contracted in Philadelphia on April 6th for the entire loan at 6% and an annuity of 1½% for 13 years. To obtain that he had to give his word that negotiations are to be opened immediately to settle our differences with England. . . .

[Rosalie S. Calvert to Jean Charles Stier, Riversdale, February 18, 1814]

. . . You ask me if my husband continues to make improvements in farming and I in my garden, etc. It is with much regret we have abandoned all work of that description for the last two years, which will not surprise you when you consider that we have in store the tobacco harvests of several years, and that since this abominable war with England, everything is double and triple the price, so that we must exercise the most scrupulous economy. . . .

The government needs a loan of thirty millions and they must give more interest to secure it. A National Bank is spoken of, and in short the public credit grows steadily worse. . . .

³⁰ Rosalie Eugenie Calvert was born October 19, 1806, married November 11, 1830, Charles Henry Carter (1802-92), nephew of General Robert E. Lee, and

Peace came again in 1815 and the means of communication across the ocean were easier. But Rosalie remained pessimistic as to the condition of the country and went so far as to predict that, "If the Democratic party continues in rule, a dissolution of the Union will be the result sooner or later."

[Rosalie S. Calvert to Jean Charles Stier, Riversdale, March 10, 1815]

. . . It is very fortunate for this country that peace was concluded, as otherwise the national bonds, banks, etc., would have gone to nothing. If we could now only get rid of our democratic administration, and have a president of the Federal party, the United States would soon recover from the losses they have suffered. Meantime, we are taxed literally up to our eyes. We have been more fortunate, however, than many others. You will have foreseen when you heard of the astonishing fall in prices that I would not sell your bonds. Everything is in a state of constant fluctuation. If I cannot shortly secure bills on advantageous terms, I shall invest the balance to your credit in public bonds until you give me further orders. . . .

As soon as George is old enough and sufficiently advanced, I should very much like to send him to an English college. We were not satisfied with the school where he was and have placed him at another at Germantown near Philadelphia. Caroline is now with Madame Greland, with whom I am quite satisfied. I fear I shall soon have to send Eugenie there too. It is not possible to educate her here. . . .

The cessation of war was the cue for the shipment by Jean Charles Stier to his sister of various articles of household furnishings, and it is evident that Rosalie enjoyed immensely the receipt of the new cups, candelabra, and books; and a magic lantern provided great amusement for the children. At the same time, the Stier collection of paintings was taken out of storage, packed, and shipped to Europe, and America lost what might have been among its rarest art treasures.

[Rosalie S. Calvert to Jean Charles Stier, Riversdale, December 16, 1815]

I have just received, dear Brother, the two cases which came over in the "Neptune" which should have been here three months ago, but I have been deprived of them all the time. We are beginning to breathe naturally after our two days' ecstasy of admiration. Please accept, dear Brother, and pray express to your wife, our gratitude for the superb cups, the interesting architecture albums, and the annals of the musee. It is impossible to decide which cup is the most beautiful, for one insists that it is the green one and another is sure it is the blue, a third declares for

died May 6, 1845. Charles Benedict Calvert was born August 23, 1808, married June 6, 1839, Charlotte Augusta Norris (d. 1876), and died May 12, 1864.

the purple, another for the scarlet, and we cannot agree except that none of them could be more beautiful. The architectural drawings are very interesting for us, as they give us an idea of the masterpieces of all countries, and the annals of the musee are still more interesting since that beautiful collection has again been dispersed in returning the pictures to those from whom they have been taken.³¹ These books should make the long evenings seem short. My children beg me to thank you heartily for the magic lantern. I had entirely forgotten how to manage it, and we could not succeed at first, but by dint of trials and endeavours to remember the time when you used to be showman for me, I succeeded to the great amusement of the children. I am very grateful to you for the trouble you took to procure the candelabra and lustres for me. They are very beautiful and arrived in perfect order. . . .

[Rosalie S. Calvert to Jean Charles Stier, June 2, 1816]

I cannot let the "Oscar" leave without writing a few lines to you, although I have only a few minutes, for packing the carts with the picture cases kept us busy until late at night and this morning they left for Baltimore. I hope you will receive them in good order. They had not been very well packed in Annapolis, for I found several quite detached from their cases. I flatter myself that they are right now. I followed all your directions. Two of the outer cases are not as strong as they should be, but we were so pressed for time that I should have risked missing this excellent opportunity if I had delayed a single day sending them from here. I hope the tarpaulin my husband ordered in Baltimore will effectually secure them against all dampness. . . . You wrote me to put tarpaulin inside the cases, but I did not venture to do so, for leaving here in June the heat might have caused the tar to run over the pictures. . . .

[Rosalie S. Calvert to Jean Charles Stier, Riversdale, November 7, 1816]

I received your letters, dear Brother, by the "Oscar" and please accept many thanks for the books you were so kind as to send for me. They are very interesting to me and will be still more so for my children. I re-read Racine and Corneille with much pleasure. I had never read Moliere nor De Lisle, so I will have all the more pleasure in learning to know them. I have heard several people here speak of Chateaubriand's work in terms of the highest eulogy. Allow me to repeat my thanks for the charming statues which arrived in perfect order. The Olympian victor is a little too *desbabillee*, but what beautiful lines and expression! . . .

[Rosalie S. Calvert to Jean Charles Stier, Riversdale, January 3, 1817]

. . . Allow me to thank you again for the books which you had the kindness to send me. They will be very useful, especially for next winter when Caroline will be here. I have begun Chateaubriand. He is highly imaginative. Moliere makes me laugh often but I am nearly afraid of

³¹ This probably refers to the art treasures gathered by Napoleon during his campaigns and later returned to their original locations.

taking up Racine, for once begun, I *cannot* put him down. I prefer him to anything I have ever read in French. . . .

There is a gap in the correspondence from 1817 to 1819, and then comes Rosalie's last letter to her brother, penned in the autumn of the latter year. The tone and content are more like the early epistles, with a pleasing mixture of business and personal affairs.

[Rosalie S. Calvert to Jean Charles Stier, Riversdale, September 19, 1819]

I received your letter of June 13th two days ago and I shall begin this by speaking of your business interests. Enclosed herewith are your accounts up to this date. The purchase of the letter of exchange has been deferred till September because the United States Bank did not want to draw on London sooner because of the great bank panic, and for the same reason it was difficult to procure a bill about which we could be sure. The affairs of the good banks are on the road to mending and I hope we will have no more of such difficulties. I will send you as soon as possible a butt of the best Madeira, but you do not tell me whether I should send it to Amsterdam or if it should be forwarded to Antwerp. It would be easy for me to send you some good wine from Baltimore, but it is seldom ships sail from that port to Antwerp and it will be more difficult to find good wine in Philadelphia. You do not say whether it should be insured or not. . . .

We are all well. I have all my children with me now, but George will go to the University at Cambridge near Boston the 1st of November. He is as tall as you. Caroline is still disengaged. None of our beaux has made the slightest impression on her heart up to now. I would not like to see her married before she is twenty-two or twenty-three. She is only nineteen now so she has an abundance of time to choose. I do not think it will be easy to please her; she exacts a great deal. When George shall have finished his education in three years from now, we shall send him to you for a year.

You ask me if we have improved Riversdale greatly. Indeed, not at all. My husband is a splendid farmer and planter, and has fine animals, cows, sheep, etc., but our place is only an American farm, and I fear very much it will continue to be such if you are not to aid us with your advice to beautify it. . . .

Rosalie Stier Calvert died early in 1821, and her brother wrote from Antwerp promising continued interest in the young family now partly grown. The two oldest children, Caroline Maria, twenty-one, and George Henry, eighteen, undertook to carry on their mother's correspondence with the uncle in Belgium.

(To be concluded)

LITERARY CULTURE IN EIGHTEENTH CENTURY MARYLAND, 1700-1776

By JOSEPH TOWNE WHEELER

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

This study was undertaken to survey literary culture in colonial Maryland during the eighteenth century. Colonial literary production was incidental to the main purpose of this analysis but wherever it has been encountered in private libraries it has been mentioned.

To counteract the effects of frontier life on the newly established church, the Reverend Thomas Bray began his novel experiment of placing books in the hands of Maryland clergymen and laymen at the close of the seventeenth century. His original plan was to furnish clergymen with parochial libraries for their own use as an incentive for coming to the colony and as a means of refreshing their religious outlook. The inventories of the early clergymen who enjoyed the use of these libraries reveal that the parochial libraries supplemented rather than supplanted the clergymen's private collections.

Bray's project was backed by the Bishop of London and the Archbishop of Canterbury, and received the support of many charitable people in England. His success with the parochial libraries encouraged him to broaden the scope of his experiment. Later, he interested Queen Anne in contributing to a provincial library at Annapolis which he called the *Bibliotheca Annapolitana*. During his short visit to the colony in 1700, his conviction was strengthened that small religious tracts and pamphlets were important in converting and holding the interest of laymen. His interesting plan for a series of tracts compiled by the Maryland clergy from standard devotional books was too ambitious for that period but during the following year he sent out more than eight laymen's libraries, each containing over seven hundred copies of important tracts. Dr. Bray and his Associates subsequently sent parochial, laymen's and provincial libraries to nearly all of the American colonies and to the West Indies. Although only a few of the many thousands of volumes he sent to the colonies still

remain, the three great charitable and missionary organizations which evolved from his original benefactions to Maryland are in existence today after more than two centuries of service to mankind.

The proportion of the population which owned books and the relative size of the private libraries were worked out from the inventories of estates and other available records. It is uncertain just what proportion of the free white population is represented in inventories of estates but they provide the best available cross section of the property owned by colonists, ranging from holdings of wealthy families such as the Dulanys to those of a man like Joseph Smith, the Baltimore County iron master, whose entire personal belongings amounted to only three pounds local currency. Sixty per cent of the four thousand inventories examined showed an ownership of books. In most cases, however, this represented a very small number of titles. Because of the uncertainty as to whether the inventories represent an accurate cross section of Maryland society it is not possible to claim that this percentage of book ownership extended throughout the whole population during the period in question. However, the comprehensive character of the Maryland inventory records examined leads one to inquire whether this proportion of book ownership can be far out of the way. There is no comparable survey of book ownership in the other colonies in the eighteenth century, and therefore it is not possible to make comparisons between Maryland and any other colony or section.

Three quarters of the private libraries mentioned in the inventories examined contained fewer than ten volumes or were described as comprising some undetermined number in a "parcel." An additional fifteen percent contained only the Bible, a Common Prayer or both. Fewer than three percent of the book collections described in the inventories contained over twenty volumes. It seems likely from this analysis of Maryland inventories that conclusions which have been drawn by students of colonial literary culture from certain large private libraries in New England and in Virginia may have to be, for those sections, considerably qualified by a further study of a more representative group including the smaller collections. To what degree these conclusions would be affected by the great number of sermons locally published in New England is still a matter to be studied.

In general, the percentage of religious books in small private libraries tended to be larger than that in the libraries containing over twenty volumes. Since it was found that twenty-three per cent of the books in twenty-five larger libraries were on religion, it is obvious that at least one-quarter of the books owned in the colony were of a religious nature. This fact seems particularly significant since it helps to minimize the difference between the literary culture of New England and that of the Southern Colonies during the eighteenth century.

Practical books on law, medicine and science were found in many libraries. In a pioneer country where the legal and medical professions were not as yet fully developed it is not surprising to find many handbooks on these subjects written for the benefit of laymen. It is apparent from the libraries of the professional class, especially lawyers and doctors educated in the mother country, that through their reading they maintained close contact with the developments in their special fields of interest.

Books on history, biography and travel were particularly popular. Educated colonists read and enjoyed the numerous histories of England and the other countries of Europe. This interest is especially noticeable toward the close of the colonial period when concern over relations with the mother country stimulated the importation of political tracts in increasing quantities.

Many of the notable authors of English literature in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries—Spenser, Shakespeare, Ben Jonson, Milton, Dryden, Pope, Addison, Fielding and others—were represented in colonial inventories, but the proportion of books of literature in the colonial libraries was not as high as has been indicated by studies in other colonies. Studies of literary culture in the southern colonies have been based almost exclusively on a small number of large private libraries of which, in some cases, nearly one-quarter of the titles were belles lettres. In the survey of the larger Maryland libraries it was found that about thirteen per cent of the books were on literature. The classics were found in some libraries, but contrary to the generally accepted notion that the more cultivated colonists read their classics in the original, the records show translations were more common than the Greek and Latin texts.

An effort has been made in this study to present a fuller view of the reading interests of Marylanders in the eighteenth century

by selecting specific lawyers, clergymen, doctors, merchants and planters and by showing by means of the inventories of their libraries and their correspondence the part that books played in their lives. The extracts from the letterbooks of Stephen Bordley, Henry Callister and the two branches of the Carroll family are particularly valuable in giving a better insight into the actual use and appreciation of books.

The slow development of bookstores in Maryland was not due to a lack of interest in reading but to the peculiar economic conditions in the tobacco colony which retarded the growth of towns and fostered a direct trade with England. The first significant bookstore in the colony was started by William Rind in 1758, and by 1773 William Aikman was operating an important store at which he sold books with a special title-page containing his name in the imprint. Books were also frequently sold in the stores of general merchants.

The earliest recorded circulating library in the English colonies was projected by William Rind in Annapolis in 1762. The priority of this library is particularly significant because it was located in a colony where the population was widely dispersed and communication was slow and often unreliable. Although this ambitious undertaking ended in failure a few years later, there was a successful circulating library in Annapolis from 1773 until 1775 when William Aikman, the proprietor, was forced to flee because of his loyalist views. An abortive attempt was made to start a circulating library in Baltimore in 1773.

A survey of this character of the literary culture of any community or section of the country is a particularly interesting undertaking because through it is freshly revealed the life of the people in new depth and perspective. It is with a genuine feeling of satisfaction that in the present study of the Maryland scene, one finds a society in which book ownership, from which we deduce literary culture in our definition of it, was customary rather than exceptional. The data presented in this study will be susceptible to further interpretation when similar investigations of eighteenth century conditions have been completed for the other colonies.

LIGHT ON THE FAMILY OF GOV. JOSIAS FENDALL

I. WILL AND SETTLEMENT OF THE ESTATE OF CAPTAIN JAMES FENDALL, A COUSIN

By NANNIE BALL NIMMO

The political history of Capt. Josias Fendall, instigator of the Fendall Rebellion and Governor of Maryland from 1656 to 1660, is to be found in the *Archives of Maryland*. He lived in Charles County, which had been erected by him in May, 1656.¹ That he was married, and died intestate leaving issue, has appeared in print, but his kin in the Old Country have not been revealed.

Samuel Fendall, who in 1664 was witness to a letter produced in court by Capt. Josias Fendall, was far less prominent than his brother.² He was many times absent from the Province, sometimes no farther away than Virginia, but it is apparent that he kept in touch with his relatives abroad.

On May 26, 1665, he demanded land for transporting himself and three other persons into the Province, and this was not the only time that he received land for those whom he brought in.³

On the 8th of August, 1665, as Samuel Fendall, Gent., of Charles County, he purchased two tracts of land from Daniel Johnson, the one tract lying on the west side of the "Wicokomeo River" and the west side of Zachia Swamp, the other on the "mayne fresh at the head of Wicokomeo River" near the land of Capt. Josias Fendall.⁴

When in 1681 the popularity of Capt. Fendall had waned, when he had been arrested and imprisoned for opposition to the ruling power, Samuel Fendall was charged with having gone to Virginia to bring men to Maryland to help his brother escape. This charge he refuted, saying that he had gone to Virginia to have "a Shallop made to hyre to Shipps."⁵

On the 14th of October, 1682, Capt. John Stansby, Sheriff of

¹ *Archives*, Vol. LIII, p. 1.

² *Ibid.*, p. 549.

³ Patent Book 7, f. 576.

⁴ *Archives*, LIII, 590.

⁵ *Archives*, XVII, 46.

Baltimore County, was ordered to permit Samuel Fendall of Charles County, or agent, to take up five or six horses and mares, that belonged to the said Fendall, which had strayed away several years before, and had been seen in these parts, some having the mark of Henry Hazlewood (whose widow had married Miles Gibson).⁶

It was in the year 1683 that Capt. James Fendall of Bright Helmstone (now Brighton) in Old England received a certificate for land which lay on the south side of the Choptank River at the head of a branch belonging to the Sassafras River, assigned to him by William Helmsley of Talbott County. The land is said to have been in Kent County. It was laid out for Capt. James Fendall and called Bright Helmston.⁷

On April 20, 1683, James Fendall, merchant, appointed Miles Gibson his attorney.⁸

Thomas Thurston, on the 13th of Dec., 1683, for 150 pounds, conveyed to Capt. James Fendall, mariner of Bright Helmston, Sussex, England, the 600-acre tract "Delph" on the west side of Delph Creek, near Rumley Marsh, and the same day Thomas Thurston conveyed to Miles Gibson the 115-acre tract, "Delph Island," on the north side of Rumley Creek.⁹

It was on the plantation "Delph" that Capt. James Fendall died, having made a will of strong human interest, found in Baltimore County Deeds, liber R M # H S. Vol. 2, f. 326, which reads as follows:

I James Fendall Sometime of Bright Helmstone in Sussex in the Kingdom of Old England Marryner but now of Baltimore County in the Province of Maryland . . . being Sick and Weake in body but sound in Mind and Memory . . . do make this my Last Will and Testament . . .

Item. I give and bequeath and my will is that my loving wife Elizabeth Fendall and her and my child whom I trust in the Lord is in being in the County of Corke in the Kingdom of Ireland Have and share all my Estate in Maryland both real and personal Together with all the profitts thereof Equally between them and Their heirs Forever, Some Legacies hereafter named Only Excepted but in Case of Mortaltyty of One or both to say wife or child that then the Moyety or all of my Estate To Go to my Dear Mother Elizabeth Fendall Residing in Bright Helmstone aforesaid

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 119.

⁷ Patent Book 21, f. 554.

⁸ Baltimore Co. Deeds, Liber R M # H S; *Maryland Hist. Mag.* XXXII, 286.

⁹ *Ibid.*

and my Loving Kinsman James Fendall son of John Fendall my Elder Brother of Bright Helmstone and in Case of my Mothers death before this my will be to her known, I give her part or the other half of this my Estate unto My Kinswoman Mary Pocock my Sisters Daughter but in Case both my Wife and Child be alive my will is that then my Mother shall have Twenty Pounds Sterling out of this my Estate and if She my said Mother be dead then the Said Twenty Pounds to be given to Mary Pocoke, My Will is That my Searge Coat with plate buttons and a pair of New Leather britches and Jacket and my best perrywigs be as Soon as possibly may be and in my own barke Sent to My said wife to be given to my Father in law Named Richard Brocklesby as a Token of my Love The remainder of my apparrell and Linnen I give to my friend Samuel Fendall also I Will That the said Samuel Fendall have a Livelyhood upon this my plantation Called Delph So Long as it Shall be unsold That is to have Vituals and Liquors Such as my plantation will aforde Also to have a thousand pounds of tobacco yearly to help by him necessaryes During The said Time (provided the said Samuel use his Endeavour to preserve the Stock of Cattle and hoggs and horses and That he will accept thereof

Item I Give unto Robert Gibson Son of Miles Gibson a Legacy of five pounds Sterling alsoe I give and bequeath unto Sarah Gibson and Ann Gibson Daughters of Miles Gibson fifty Shillings a piece Which said Legacys to be paid Their Said Father in some Convenient Time after my decease . . .

Item My will is that my overseers and Trustees of this my Last will and Testament do cause my Vessel or Barke to be fitted for the Seas and Laded with my Tobacco and same so Laden to be sent to Corke There to be Delivered With her burthen to my said Wife as part of my Estate for the use aforesaid.

Item I do hereby Constitute and Appoint my Loving Friends Edward Bedell and John Walstone to be my Overseers and Trustees of This my Last will and Testament and Cause the Same to be brought to Probate and have the management of all My Estate keeping it Intire altogether upon my Plantation for the use aforesaid Also I do Impower my Said Overseers and Trustees to Sell my Plantation and what Belongeth unto it as Stock Servants Slaves as Soon as they Can Either for Moneys or Some Moneys or Some Tobaccos The Produce thereof and its Profitts in the mean Time to be Shipp As aforesaid as part of my Estate [?] and Likewise to Sell a Piece of Land Lying in Caecil County and Whereas I Desired my Friend and Nebour Miles Gibson to manage Some Business for me Between Philip Lynes Nehemiah Blackstone and Abraham Blagg and mySelf I refer it wholly to him and if he sees Occasion to Employ an Attorney I impower him so to do to help manage The same without the help or anyways trouble of my Said Overseers or Trustees Haveing Given him the said Gibson Instructions from Under my hand in order to the management of the same A copy of this my Will to be Sent in my Barke this Next Spring Ensueing to my Wife and Another to my Brother John Fendall In witness whereof I have hereunto Set my hand and Seal this

31st of August 1689 A Codicil to this Will My Two Silver Spoons
marked J. F.-E. B. and my Little Silver Cup to be Sent to my Wife

James Fendall (seal)

his
Wit. Mark Richardson Thomas + Low
mark

her
Timothy Heskar Jane H Judd
mark

The bark seems not to have reached its destination, and the settlement of Capt. James Fendall's estate gave rise to much contention, for in 1692,

Came into Court Samuel Fendall of Baltimore County, Gent., and showed to the Judge here that Edward Beddle and John Walston, Overseers of the last will and testament of James Fendall, deceased, (who by virtue thereof administered in part the Estate of the said deceased) were themselves now lately dead, the said will of the said James and the administration of his Estate not yet fully executed and completed, And therefore hath said Samuel For and on behalf and in the right of Elizabeth Fendall his Kinswoman the widow and relict of the said James Fendall asked for Letters of administration de bonis of the sd deceased's Estate, that he might be thereby the better Enabled to Manage and look after the same for the sd widow according to her desire and request in her Letter to ye sd Samuel of the 12 of May, 1691, here produced.¹⁰

Corke the 12 of May 91

Loving Kinsman

I rece'd thine of the 23 of July 1690 an acct of my Dear Husbands will, being deceased September 1689 which I rec'd very Kindly and shall if lyes in my power be always to retalliate ye same

As my husband left thee upon the plantation Soe I do not doubt by thy care will be for my good, will pray continue and encourage the plantation that nothing may be out of order when I send which will be in some little time I hope, and then I may find that will greatly incline me to gratitude. I understand that John Fendall have employed one that is gone to Virginia, to dispose of my husbands concerns for his acct thinking Jas. is dead, wich proceedings I utterly forbid, and if any Such thing is done, it is his owne wrong and that he shall know, for altho my husband is dead I am not left destitute of those friends that will right me in this Case.

Thy Loving Kinswoman
Eliza ffendall

To Samu^l ffendall
In May¹⁴

¹⁰ Testamentary Proceedings, Liber 15a, p. 5.

The same year Samuel Fendall, administrator of the will of James Fendall, produced a Letter of Attorney reading in part as follows:

Know all men by these presents that I John Fendall of Topsham in the County of Devon, Mariner, the onely Brother and heir of James Fendall late of Baltimore County, Maryland, deceased have made my Loving Couzin, Samuel Fendall of Baltimore County, aforesaid my true and lawful Attorney to sell my said Brothers plantation, goods . . . [dated] Oct. 4, 1692.¹¹

And now that Samuel Fendall was ready to perform the administration of the unadministered part of James Fendall's estate, the daughters of Edward Beedle, namely, Martha, who as widow of George Goldsmith, had married John Hall, and Mary, the wife of George Utie, with Margaret, who as widow of John Wals-ton, had married William Osbourne, wanted to claim the right as trustees, to have some part in the administration.¹²

On April 3, 1694, a suit was brought against Hall and his wife, Utie and his wife and Osbourne and his wife.¹³ On the 10th of September, 1694, Samuel Fendall, administrator of the will of James Fendall appeared in court in connection with the proceedings.¹⁴ On Sept. 17, 1694, John Hall, sheriff, stated: "We have a report that Samuel Fendall is dead, if he be pray I enter a Caveat that none administration issue out without further information from me, I being highest creditor."¹⁵ No administration account on the estate of Samuel Fendall has come to light.

II. JOSEPH GROWDEN REPORTS ON FENDALL PROPERTY

With Introduction by WILLIAM B. MARYE

The text of the following letter is quoted in part from an old copy, which was found among the Chew Papers, property of the Harford County Historical Society. The writer, Joseph Growden (as the name is commonly spelt) of Bucks County, Pennsylvania, was a man who, for many years, was a member of the Council of

¹¹ *Ibid.*, 15e, f. 4.

¹² *Ibid.*, f. 5.

¹³ *Ibid.*, 15e, f. 43.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, f. 126.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, f. 128.

that province, and was one time Speaker of the House of Burgesses. This letter tells the rather pathetic story of a young man wasting his patrimony, running up bills and boastfully giving himself out for older than he was. Edward Beedle (d. 1692) and John Wallston or Wallstone (d. 1693) were Justices, of the Quorum, and otherwise prominent men at the head of the Bay in what is now Harford County. William Osborne, who married Wallston's widow, was one of the very earliest settlers on Bush River. He was known as "Duke," from which fact it seems possible that he claimed to be related to the ducal family of Leeds, whose name was Osborne. All three men have many living descendants. Among the Archer Papers is a manuscript of the late eighteenth century, which gives a list of Edward Beedle's descendants who were then living, an indication of the esteem in which he was held.

Colonel George Wells (d. 1696), a high ranking military man and official, who, it seems, practiced medicine on the side, was the nabob of those parts at the time of his death. The amount of his bill makes one gasp, even at this late date, but, in fairness, it must be remembered that we are not told to what expense and trouble he was put in taking care of the deceased Fendall, and the Hon. Mr. Growden had a prejudice against the "ungodly" inhabitants of a "debauched" Maryland.

The land called Delph was taken up under that name by Francis Stockett. It has had many owners and at one time belonged to the Paca family. Delph lies on the Bay-side in Harford County, between the small creek called Delph Creek, which divides it from Gouldsmith's hall ("The Bay Farm") and the marshes of Old Woman's Gut, on the north, and the head of Little Romney Creek (Port Royal Creek), and is the land next above Taylor's Island (Delph Island). The landing of Delph Farm was situated on Delph Creek in a grove of sweet gum trees of unusual size, and was a spot of great natural beauty. In 1917 the farm became part of the property of the Aberdeen Proving Ground, since when all of its landmarks have doubtless been effaced.

7

Philadelphia 25^e ber 1694

Dear Cousen Richard Brocklsby

Thy lres by Richd Russell and thy sonne my cousen Edwd I have received

and taking notice of their contents shall to the utmost of my ability answer thy request therein as being thereunto firmly obliged as well by my ffathers injunctions as allsoe by the naturall duty incumbent on me to serve my so dear & near relations they llre by Russell was detained from me 7 weeks after arrival in New Yorke & came not to my hand untill cousin Edward arrived from Barbadoes soone after which I went to New Yorke & demanded they money of Miles ffoster with reasonable allowance for damage, I found him very willing to take up his bill, more in respect and regard of his own credit than creditors good he would feine have put me off with the principall 55^l alleging that he had soe satisfied other creditts (which indeed he had lately done to my knowledge for considerable sums) but I thought his ppposition to be very unjust & knowing him to be able gott him at length willing to pay the 55^l with twenty pe advance for damage which was all I could doe . . . lesse would contest in lawe the event of which would be hazardous especially because the protest was not on the originall bill but on thy bill pat to Phil: fford the whole summe reduced unto the country money comes to 82-10s whereof Cous Edw^d had received about 30 pounds of Miles before I sawe him the rest is in my hands which I shall take, [etc, etc.] I am now on my journey with cousin Edward (by Gods permission) for Maryland to see how matters will stand there touching ye estate of which wee can yett have title but that ye both trustees are dead ye ship sold to John Edmondson an old acquaintance of mine from whom I doubt we are like to have more words than money, Sam^l ffendall still on the plantation, it is well if the profits be not all spent in: in perusing the writings I had from thee, I find thy daught^r died unpossessed of the estate of ffendall her husband which I fear may be of ill consequence to us, if . . . we must with cunning and knavish persons now in possession, I have consulted the best counsell here and shall use my best endeavor . . . ence in ye management of the affair and I hope nothing . . . me to gett thy sonne in possession . . . I shall now give thee a large account how thy . . . in Maryland stands vizt I found old Samuell Fendall (a poore sorry . . . man) on the plantation called Delph (which was all ye . . . they sonne in law owned in Maryland) allowed administrator of . . . goods remained of James ffendall's estate unadministered by [Walston] and Beedle the inventory which he exhibited unto the comm^{rs} amounting to about 120 lbs ste[r]ling which constituted 3 negroes and 2 little negroe children vallued in 66^l the rest ab^t 20 head of cattle ab^t such a number of hoggs . . . horse and a small number of poore household stuff all the rest of the moveable estate administered or rather destroyed by ye former trustees and ye estate brought indebted to their executors soe that they demand about 16 thousand wt of tobacco from it, ffendall he brings in an account of 16 thousand tobacco due him for his management one Coll: Geo Wells demanded 26^l ste for James's sickness & physick in his house for about 3 weeks time, other debts charged to ye vulture of at least a thir [?] of tobacco several law suits depending and to say truely all in dis . . . , I found S. ffendall unwilling to give up ye possession of ye

plantation pretending to keep it for a Br's son to James in England who layd claime to it and by llre (which he shewed me) ordered him to manage it for him, but after awhile I had been there by argument & fair words ye best I could advance brought him to give it up peaceably then taking his accounts giving him an instrument under my hand & seale to keep him harmless from a bond he had given into the commissary or ordenaries office for ye true performance of his administrators in they daughter's right, I left thy son in possession of ye plantation desiring and cautioning him that he should doe nothing in his own name nor without my advice, though he then declared he was of age and since by many great asseverations says he is upwards of 21 years old, I would then have him to tarry there but a little while and when he had informed himself of ye state of all matters to follow me home with a full account and gave it as my opinion & advice to him that the best course to be taken was to sell off immediately ye negroes and ye stock leaving a couple of sowes [?] and a few swine on it and let it out to a tennant by which means ye debts might have been compounded for and mostly paid off for they would be mitigated and brought under . . . soe to leave things rest till thy advice was had concerning it . . . was a thing not to be thought of [here follow several lines which are partly illegible] . . . Maryland, a debauched place among ill and ungodly company . . . But as soon as I came from Maryland he gave himself out for 21 years of age and assumed to himself and in his own name to act and doe all business there and gave bills for 25^l ste to Wells, which I believe might have been composed for much less it being a very unreasonable and unconscionable charge and for nine thousand weight of tob to ffendall whereby he brought other creditors upon him who arrested him in severall actions and though they could doe nothing to him (for he was neither adm^r nor executor and in his nonage too) yett it was matter of scandall and disparagement to him, but that which is worst of all is, that instead of lessening ye debts on ye plantation by converting what was there to help pay it off, my cousen hath kept a chargeable ffamily there all winter spent the provisions drunk up all ye sider and contracted severall considerable debts, besides 30^l bill drawn on thy friend Cooke in London, though I cautioned him before and begged him that he would by noe means draw one bill of exchange on thee but for what money he had occasion for he should have of me though I had not thy direct order for it but he told me he had order to draw on thee for two or three hundred pounds and would doe it as he had occasions and if I had not used my endeavour to prevent it I fear he would have troubled thee with much more though none of it should goe to do things absolutely necessary, I write this cosen with noe small regret and sorrow were it not I think I ought as a friend soe to do my pen should never be employed in such an information but ye necessity of ye case I think will apollogeize for me . . . for now instead of making thee some return which I had great hopes to doe and very well might have done if thou hadst sent they letter of attorney 2 years since, I believe then I might have . . . at least 300 lbs out of that in Mary-

land and New York but now I am affrayd all I can scrape together will hardly make up the breach so as to pay off all ye debts and furnish Cous: Edward with necessaries to carry him home to thee, and keep ye land clear, for I have pd out this 52^l od [sic] money received of Miles fisher[?] for cloathes for they sonne and to ffendall some other necessary occasions . . . 30£ soe that there is little left considering what is to doe for cous: Edward must have some more being out of apparrell (except he could draw bill on thee, which I will not suffer if I can help it, presuming that it will not be pleasing unto thee) and ffendall (who is a poor man) must be paid speedily and on the plantation there is very little to be had but negroes and the cattle which will all be required and more if it were there to pay ye debts, I am speedily designed to goe again to Maryland (if God will?) to compose and end as much as in me lyes all matters there after which I will give thee a more particular account which to doe now would be imperfect Edward tells of going home in this ship ye Bristoll [?] Merchant (but I am not certain whether he will or not) therefore was willing to send this by Nathaniel Pennick . . . Christopher Pennick formerly an inhabitant of Ireland; . . . as for the plantation which I had almost forgotten it is 6 or 7 hundred acres of land about 50 acres [cleared?] a good orchard, which will mostly bear 50 or 60 sometimes more barrels of cyder a year if well looked after, if it were to be sold I conceive it might yield 200 lbs hardly more, there is allsoe 100 acres of land in another county which is worth about twenty thousand tobacco ye business with Philip Line & C is an ill confused concern the Bills of Exchange the chief evidence of it being lost and Line a person troublesome enough to deale with, it now lyes in Chancery but what will be ye issue I can hardly judge I fear matter of cost and little gaine though in equity I think we have a very good action, but of it more hereafter. I am of opinion that a good action lyes against ye executors of Beedle and Walston for ye sloup Wm and Sarah but there wants better evidence to make out ye right to be in thee when thy . . . ffendall on his will seemingly declaring it his; I have not yet seen those men for they were from home at my being in Maryland, but I hope I shall doe pretty well with them (though their demands be high) I think I have severall advantages against them because . . . and their selling ye vessell without power soe to doe. I add little more but that I was very glad to hear from thee and my dear cousen thy wife and was all as glad to see my kinsman thy sonne having great desire to serve you according to my power & could with all my heart wish that I had not been interrupted by my cousen's indiscreet carriage as to what thou writest concerning my ffathers mind to purchase an estate with you I have noe mind to it, for though I have gone through much trouble here in this new settlement, yett I bless God my estate here is very considerable, and this country soe would be for many more that would adventure to come from any part of Europe to these parts for here is land enough and good and a quiet peacable government beyond all other and (I praise God for his mercy's) many a good honest hearted people here are, which enjoy his blessed providence; I have had 2 children

since our being here ye eldest a girle ab' ten years old and ye youngest a boy a little Laurence near one year old ye onely sone we have had in 23 years of our marriage, a very lovely thriving child my self and my wife and my elder daughter tender thee and dear Cous: Lovely our joint love and respects bidding you and yours farewell and I rest

Dear cousen

. . . Kinsman

Jose Growdon

Cous Edward is here and in good health. if hee goes I shall send thee a few lines

Jerusalem [?] in ye county of Bucks in Pennsylvania

10th 2 Mo., 1695

BOOK REVIEWS

David Glasgow Farragut, Our First Admiral. By CHARLES LEE LEWIS.
Annapolis: U. S. Naval Institute [1943], 513 pp. \$4.50.

This is the second and final volume of Professor Lewis' life of Farragut. The first volume, published in 1941, dealt with his hero from the time he became a midshipman in 1811 before completing his tenth year (and was thereafter addressed as "Mr." Farragut by the old tars before the mast!) up to the eve of the Civil War. This volume rounds out his last ten crowded years. He died in 1870.

Farragut was not a showy man and this is not a showy book, but the man in his unpretentious style was a hero, and the book does him justice. His fame rests upon two actions: the capture of New Orleans and the Battle of Mobile Bay. And what insignificant actions they seem today beside the tremendous and repeated engagements taking place in both hemispheres! The difference is only in scale of course. In 1943 as in 1862 the same combination of brains and dash is required to make the great naval officer. Farragut, simple and single-hearted man, had it. It seems that in 1862 after the long years of peace, dash was not too well appreciated among the officer personnel of our navy. There are several instances quoted in this book of under-officers who had the effrontery to assert that Farragut was unfit to command because he was *too* daring.

The Civil War Navy in general shows up in a pretty poor light. It is distressing to read of the timidity, the incapacity, the back-biting and the downright lying that prevailed among the officers. Of course there were good and brave officers, too; they did the best they could with what they had and kept their mouths shut, whereas the no-good ones spent their time writing letters to other officers and to the Secretary of the Navy in an endeavor to undermine better men than themselves. They never expected that these letters would get into print! Second-rate men always act thus. Luckily, in our vaster and more tightly-organized navy of today, their opportunities of doing harm are strictly curtailed.

In addition to his qualities as a commander, Farragut was a warm and lovable man, slow to suspect disloyalty, merciful towards weakness but like granite in the presence of disobedience. The author might have developed this side of his character a little further. On several occasions he speaks of Farragut's animation and his love of talk, but gives us no examples (that I can recall) of his intimate talk. Perhaps none have survived. His letters are warm enough, particularly those to his son and only child who was 44 years younger than himself. Farragut had no difficulty in bridging the gap of years and neither had the boy. Especially moving is the letter of Farragut to his wife, in which he explains why he sent the boy ashore when battle was impending. It was not proper, he explained, that the anxieties of a father should be added to those of the commander. It was of his country he was thinking, not himself.

In this volume Professor Lewis appears to have allowed himself a greater freedom of expression. He even makes a joke now and then. This is all to the good; it makes his book more readable without in the least damaging its authority. But after all, this is a work for the specialist rather than the general reader. The author's industry is astonishing. It is not likely that any additional information about Farragut will be dug up by his successors. But the uninformed reader may be confused by the mass of detail that is presented here and the many characters that come and go.

HULBERT FOOTNER.

The Free State of Maryland: A History of the State and Its People, 1634-1941. . . . By FREDERIC ARNOLD KUMMER. *Also Contemporary Maryland*, by FERDINAND C. LATROBE. Baltimore and Hopkinsville, Kentucky: Historical Record Association [1943]. 1578 pp. Published by subscription.

In these days when the Atlantic Charter has called to our attention the four freedoms, it is fitting to recall the fact that of all the colonies established by Great Britain in the New World the Province of Maryland symbolized a region where there was freedom from want, freedom of religion, freedom of speech and freedom from fear. Frederick Arnold Kummer and Ferdinand C. Latrobe have thus rightly named their history, *The Free State of Maryland, A History of the State and Its People, 1634-1941*. The work comprises four volumes. The print is clear and legible and the format excellent.

Mr. Kummer has divided his contribution to the history of Maryland into four parts: Part I, "The Colonial Period"; Part II, "The Revolutionary Period"; Part III, "The Civil War Period," and Part IV, "Maryland in the Twentieth Century." There are forty-five chapters and 343 pages devoted to his historical account. Mr. Latrobe, as supervising editor, has called his division of the book "Contemporary Maryland." This is a compilation of short articles by various authors. Included in Volume I is "Maryland Law," by the late Carroll T. Bond, Chief Judge of the Court of Appeals, Maryland; "The Municipal Museum," by Richard Carl Medford; "Inland Fishing," by Frank L. Bentz, Chief Clerk, State Game and Inland Fish Commission; and "Musicians and Music," by Frederick R. Huber, Municipal Director of Music, Baltimore. In Volume II pages 369 to 439 contain other articles on contemporary activities in the State. The biographical sketches which fill part of Volume II and the remaining volumes indicate the important part played by Maryland citizens past and present in the State's history.

The style is pleasing for popular reading. It seems to be chiefly a compilation from other histories. No footnote references are given and few references used to source materials previously undiscovered so the work can hardly be considered an important contribution to the field of his-

torical literature. As stated in the opening Announcement, the author and publisher make no claims to originality, as the aim is "to place [the facts] all in one edition, thereby giving the reader a complete library on historical happenings in Maryland, with only the flip of the page necessary to change the story before him." This purpose is perhaps fulfilled and thus justifies the publication as an introduction to the biographical sketches which follow.

It would be a help in referring to the facts given if Volume I had an index for that would enable even a casual reader to quickly find the facts which are stated in an interesting fashion. It will be impracticable in a short review to comment on many of the chapters, but it is impossible to treat the causes of the American Revolution in one paragraph as the author has done. In a book with the title of *The Free State* more time should have been devoted to these causes, for today they are still uppermost in men's minds. The State Constitution for the same reason deserves more attention.

The chapters on the War of 1812 are more amply treated and give a brief but excellent account of the part played by the State in that conflict. In the chapter on Civil "Wartime Problems of a Border State" the author greatly underestimates the importance of the preservation of the Union in the struggle between the states. Had this not been the leading issue and had the Union not been preserved, who knows but that our land might not have suffered the evils of a disrupted Europe. It is also not shown that the emigrants who came from Europe and who sided with the North in the conflict did so because they, as free laborers, did not want to compete with slave labor. The author is clearly biased in his opinion concerning the conflict so disastrous to a border state and does not look at the matter from a historical viewpoint. He does, however, draw the correct conclusion regarding the evils resulting from the death of Lincoln and explains the motives back of the assassination clearly.

Mr. Kummer's accounts of the history of the various counties make one wish that time and space had permitted their expansion. One could spend a number of pleasant hours perusing the pages of *The Free State of Maryland* and feel well rewarded for the effort.

ESTHER M. DOLE

Washington College, Chestertown, Maryland

Six Quaker Clockmakers [1682-1813]. By EDWARD E. CHANDLEE. Philadelphia: Historical Society of Pennsylvania, 1943. xvii, 260 pp. \$10.00

The study of a family group of capable early American craftsmen is bound to bring to light not only the peculiar skill of the workers themselves but the cultural background in which they worked and which they helped to mould. Mr. Chandlee in his carefully compiled and beautifully illustrated book tells us of the activities as clockmakers over a period of a century and a half of no less than eight members of the Chandlee family,

who for five generations practiced clockmaking either in Philadelphia, in Nottingham and Baltimore, Maryland, in Wilmington, Delaware, or in Winchester, Virginia. The story, which centers more especially in eighteenth century Nottingham, near the Pennsylvania-Maryland line, begins with Quaker Abel Cotley who settled in Philadelphia in 1682 and taught his trade to his Quaker son-in-law, Benjamin Chandlee. The latter moved to Nottingham Township, then in Chester County, Pennsylvania, although his clockmaking descendants were later to find themselves south of the Mason and Dixon Line and residents of Cecil County, Maryland, as the result of the settlement of the long standing boundary dispute between Lord Baltimore and the Penns. A Benjamin II continued to make clocks in Cecil County near Nottingham, as did the latter's three sons in the fourth generation—Goldsmith, Ellis, and Isaac Chandlee. Goldsmith afterwards moved to Winchester, Virginia, and carried on his trade there. Benjamin III in the fifth generation was a clockmaker in Baltimore. This is indeed an extraordinary record in hereditary craftsmanship which more than equals that of the silversmithing Bruff family of the Eastern Shore of Maryland.

The author's success in bringing to light interesting biographical details about the various clockmaking members of the Chandlee family has only been exceeded by his achievement in tracing the very numerous examples of the work of these craftsmen which are so well brought out in the admirable gravure plates. Illustrations are given of some sixty-eight tall clocks, with the Chandlee name on the dial, which the author has found, forty of them owned by descendants of the original purchasers. These clocks with few exceptions are housed in well designed walnut cases, probably made by neighboring cabinet makers outside the Chandlee shops. The brass works are of Chandlee workmanship, as are certainly, for the first three generations, the exceedingly well designed brass dials. For a later period, however, imported painted iron dials were used with painted dial decorations which were doubtless added by local artists for the Chandlees. Illustrations are also given of surveyors' compasses, sun dials, brass inkwells, and candlestands which bear the Chandlee name.

This book is of especial interest to Marylanders since most of the eighteenth century work of this clockmaking family was done at Nottingham, Cecil County. A great many of these clocks are still in the hands of the owners living in that neighborhood. The author and the Historical Society of Pennsylvania, under whose auspices this book appears, are to be congratulated not only upon the scholarly research which it reveals but upon the format in which it appears. It is to be hoped that it is but the forerunner of other books, bearing the imprint of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania, upon the painters and craftsmen of Pennsylvania.

J. HALL PLEASANTS

Maryland During and After the Revolution: A Political and Economic Study. By PHILIP A. CROWL. [The Johns Hopkins University Studies in Historical and Political Science, Series LXI, Number 1.] Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1943. 185 pp. \$1.75.

Maryland history during the Revolution and the period preceding the establishment of the Federal Government has never received proper treatment. Mr. Crowl has filled the gap with his study of "the interplay of events, institutions, interests, and personalities" during the years from the formation of the State government in 1776 to the ratification of the Constitution in 1788. His survey of men, classes, and movements not only throws light on a hitherto obscure part of state history, but it also provides a study which must remain the basis of all future work on the subject.

The author begins with a discussion of the use by previous writers of the word "critical" to describe the period between the close of the Revolution and the adoption of the Federal Constitution and remarks that in Maryland, at least, there was little to indicate that conditions were chaotic at that time. He says that the fights which featured the sessions of the legislature and were prominent in the press did reflect conflicts of interests, but did not indicate a "clear-cut division either of well-defined economic classes or of geographic sections" such as apparently existed in other states. In Maryland, the Revolutionary movement was largely the work of the same group which had led the opposition to the Proprietors in the Provincial Assembly. The leaders of that opposition were the same men who later occupied the principal posts in all the gatherings of the Revolutionary era and who took over the reins of government after the State became a separate unit. Mr. Crowl analyzes the careers of certain representative figures and shows that the group which controlled Maryland consisted of men of property—lawyers, merchants, and landed gentry. They were allied to each other by common interests and, in many cases, by blood relationships. There was no real democratization of the government of Maryland after the break with England.

The study takes up in succession the questions of the confiscation and sale of British property, the collection of pre-war British debts, and the struggle for paper money and debtor relief. Mr. Crowl considers in detail the interests of the various men in each of these matters and shows that the attitude of some, such as Samuel Chase and Captain Charles Ridgely, was influenced directly by their own purchases of property or by their debts owed to British merchants. Further, he points out that in Maryland, unlike other states, "the debtor and creditor interests were not clearly geographically segregated." The controversy over the adoption of the Federal Constitution was a continuation of the previous disputes. Generally speaking, the men who opposed ratification were the same who had favored paper money; and there is good documentation of the ownership by men on both sides of public securities and of slaves. The reader gets the impression that the majority in Maryland were swayed by personal interests. The description of the ratifying convention at Annapolis brings

out the importance of its action on the result in Virginia, and, incidentally, the vital part played by George Washington in procuring Maryland's assent.

This study is based on a thorough examination of all classes of sources, particularly official manuscripts at the Hall of Records and family papers at the Maryland Historical Society. It is a valuable work, and small errors—such as transposing the location of "Wye House" and "Wye Hall" (pp. 24, 27), assigning Dr. Fred Ridgely to the "Hampton" family of which he was not a member (p.48), and calling Dr. Lyde Goodwin "Lyle" (p. 53)—may be forgiven. The analysis of family relationships in "Maryland's governing class" (pp. 139-41) is enough to arouse the admiration of the most exacting genealogist.

WILLIAM D. HOYT, JR.

Journal & Letters of Philip Vickers Fithian, 1773-1774: A Plantation Tutor of the Old Dominion. Edited, with an Introduction, by HUNTER DICKINSON FARISH. Williamsburg, Virginia: Colonial Williamsburg, Incorporated, 1943. xlv, 323 pp. \$4.00.

When Philip Vickers Fithian was twenty-six years old, and a Princeton graduate, he went to Virginia to be tutor to the children of Robert Carter of Nomini Hall. This was in October, 1773, and he stayed at Nomini until October, 1774. During that time he kept a journal day by day, and he wrote many letters. Most of the journal and some of the letters were published in 1900 by the Princeton Press. Now journal and letters are republished by Colonial Williamsburg in an exceedingly attractive form, with more attention to Virginia than the earlier edition showed.

Fithian was born, reared and educated in New Jersey, and was preparing himself for the Presbyterian ministry which he later entered. His whole background was worlds apart from the lordly Virginia into which he went, but he was able to adjust himself to it, to see it sympathetically, and to love it. When, in October, 1774, he turned his horse's head toward New Jersey, he says in his Journal, "left Home." His place in the Carter household gave him a chance to see and to take part in all that went on in the Northern Neck, and he did not, happily for us who read his journal, confine himself to the school room. As he says to his friend John Peck, who succeeded him at Nomini, he made it a rule to go wherever Mr. Carter suggested he go, and "stay, and talk, & drink, & ride to as great excess as" Mr. Carter did. He went to church and to dances, to fish feasts and sailing parties and dinners and to county courts. He talked with Mr. Carter about plantation business, and with Mrs. Carter about managing the garden and the household and the children. For Mrs. Carter he had a respect and an admiration not short of reverence. The Carter family and all their friends liked him, too, and made all sorts of plans to find him a wife, and get him to settle down in Virginia. But his course had been laid out toward the ministry, and the girl he loved was back there in New Jersey; so back he went.

For editing and publishing this new edition of Fithian, Colonial Williamsburg deserves praise and real thanks. There are two or three errors, nonetheless, and they must be pointed out. Mrs. Robert Carter's name was Frances Tasker, not Frances Anne Tasker. It is true that, according to Fithian, she once gave her name as Ann Tasker Carter (p. 81), but, weighing that one reference against all the other contemporary ones, it must be concluded that Fithian wrote her daughter's name instead of her own. The earliest reference to her as Frances Ann goes no further back than 1899. This mistake is the more annoying in that it had already been called to the editor's attention before the book went to press. Another mistake is the description of Anne (Tasker) Ogle, Rebecca (Tasker) Dulany, and Elizabeth (Tasker) Lowndes as sisters of Anne (Bladen) Tasker, and not as her daughters. The portrait of Robert Carter as a young man is incorrectly ascribed to Sir Joshua Reynolds, though Reynolds was out of England during the entire period of Carter's stay there, and so had no studio at all. The portrait, according to the Huntington Library, was probably done by Thomas Hudson, teacher of Reynolds. But these errors, though real, are more than offset by the benefit derived from publication of the Journal and letters. For one feature of this edition the editor deserves the highest possible praise. The letters are not gathered together in a body at the end of the journal. Instead, each letter is inserted into the Journal at the place where its date indicates it belongs, and letters and Journal form one smooth, coordinated whole. The temptation to quote bits from here and there throughout must be sternly resisted, but the book deserves to be read entire.

ELIZABETH MERRITT

The First Century of Flight in America: An Introductory Survey. By JEREMIAH MILBANK, JR. Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1943. 248 pp. \$2.75.

This book is interesting and informative not only to persons interested in the history of air navigation but to the general reader as well. But it is particularly interesting to Marylanders, for it describes in some detail several events in the early history of Baltimore which indicate a surprisingly large interest in aerial travel on the part of Baltimoreans more than a century ago and even as far back as 150 years ago.

How many Marylanders, for example, are aware that the first authenticated balloon ascension by a human on the North American continent occurred in Baltimore? This incident, of no little historical importance, occurred on June 24, 1784, and the intrepid aeronaut was Edward Warren, a boy only thirteen years old. Mr. Milbank tells how young Warren ascended into the blue in a small Montgolfier balloon constructed by Peter Carnes of Blagdensburg (sic) Maryland. Scene of the epochal ascension was "a field near Baltimore," and Warren became the first American ever to ascend into the air because the balloon, only 30 feet high and 35 feet in diameter, apparently was too small to lift its maker, Carnes.

Fifty years later, in 1834, aeronauts both professional and amateur, had become so active in Baltimore that Mr. Milbank says "citizens even began to object to Baltimore's excessive air-mindedness." Baltimore newspapers engaged in a species of feud over whether balloon ascensions were "dangerous and obnoxious pastimes" or whether they were leading toward a new age of aerial navigation. Despite the objections, experiments in Baltimore continued and in 1838 one John H. Pennington undertook to patent a flying machine powered by a small steam engine and driven by propellers resembling windmill wheels. Mr. Milbank points out that "luckily for Pennington's physical well-being he was dissuaded from completion of his machine."

Interesting though those local allusions are, they constitute only a very small part of Mr. Milbank's admirable book. In it the author outlines, succinctly and clearly, the beginnings of aeronautical development in this country, tells of the slow but steady progress made by daring and ingenious inventors in pushing the conquest of the air, and ends his account on the eve of the period when aviation was just about to supplant aeronautics as a mode of travel—and of warfare.

JAMES C. MULLIKIN

Maryland: The State and Its Government. By HARRY BARD. New York: Oxford Book Co., 1943. 122 pp. 80 cents.

"Attainment of the democratic ideal assumes an intelligent participating citizenry. Effective cooperation is possible only if there is understanding of the goals we seek and desire to attain. And though our first allegiance must be to the Nation, nevertheless we must also be active and devoted citizens of State, county, and municipality. To further such activity is the aim and intent of this little volume."

This unpretentious work by the supervisor in history and civics of the public high schools of Baltimore is a well-rounded summary of the government of State and City—the first fresh work in this field since Dr. Ella Lonn's text for use of new women voters published in 1921.

Despite its brevity, the book covers most of the activities of the grand divisions of our government. In clear and simple language are set forth the administrative structures and the functions of legislatures and courts. There are even brief sections on geography, climate and the general history of the State. If one wishes to know, for instance, the provisions of our much criticized Declaration of Intentions law, the regulations in controlling industry, business, the trades and professions, or what the State does for the needy and the handicapped, the answers are found here. If not all of them will satisfy the adult student, at least the teacher in the high school as well as his pupils will find the outline needed. The latest changes by the Legislature have been included.

Mr. Bard has provided a greatly needed civics book for school and library. Unfortunately the index leaves much to be desired.

JAMES W. FOSTER

John Bach McMaster, American Historian. By ERIC GOLDMAN. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1943. 194 pp. \$2.00.

This short, neat biography of John Bach McMaster was written with the "generous co-operation of his family." That sounds like an official work. But enquiry reveals that this is not true, and even a hasty reading proves that it could not have been so. No family, ordering a biography of its most prominent member, would include the fact that a group of his graduate students once went to him to talk about his "faults as a teacher." The honesty of the book—if not the sensitiveness of its subject—is shown by the quite thorough "deadly parallel" comparison of parts of the *History of the People of the United States* with works used by the author in its preparation, and used without benefit of quotation marks or reference. One appendix analyzes parts of the *History*; one lists McMaster's printed works—there are near a hundred of them; the last is a bibliography. Dr. Goldman has done a conscientious job; if the picture the book presents is not an interesting or a significant one, that is not the biographer's fault.

E. M.

Clarke County, a Daughter of Frederick. A History of Early Families and Homes. By ROSE M. E. MACDONALD. Berryville, Va.: Blue Ridge Press, 1943. [74] pp. \$1.80.

In this brochure are to be found notes relating to the famous military figures of Clarke County in earlier wars, the celebrated estates with which it abounds, the well-known families, and the churches, shops, and mills which dot the area. Miss MacDonald has drawn on court records as well as on available genealogical materials. The names of Lees, Pages, Nelsons, Burwells, Washingtons, Byrds and Carters abundantly sprinkle these pages.

J. W. F.

OTHER BOOKS RECEIVED

The Declaration of Independence: The Evolution of the Text. . . . [By JULIAN P. BOYD. Foreword by ARCHIBALD MACLEISH]. Washington: Library of Congress, 1943. 36 pp., 10 plates. Gift of publisher.

The St. Mary's City "Castle," Predecessor of the Williamsburg "Palace." By HENRY C. FORMAN. Reprinted from *William and Mary College Quarterly*, April, 1942. 8 pp. Gift of author.

Captain Ridgely's London Commerce, 1757-1774. By WILLIAM D. HOYT, JR., Reprinted from *Americana*, April, 1943. 45 pp. Gift of author.

Maryland Women. Vol. III. By MARGIE H. LUCKETT. Baltimore: The author, 1942. 444 pp.

Jews in American Wars. By J. GEORGE FREDMAN and LOUIS A. FALK. New York: Jewish War Veterans of the U. S. 1942. 60 pp. \$1.25. Gift of Maryland Free State Post, No. 167, Jewish War Veterans of the United States.

Records of the Moravians in North Carolina. Vol. VI, 1793-1808. Edited by ADELAIDE L. FRIES. Raleigh: State Dept. of Archives and History, 1943. Received on exchange.

NOTES AND QUERIES

WASHINGTON COUNTY HISTORICAL SOCIETY

On July 4th the Society had planned to observe with an elaborate celebration the 200th anniversary of the founding of Hagerstown. Because of gasoline curtailment, however, activities were confined to memorial services at Zion Reformed Church where Mayor Sweeney, in the name of the Washington County Historical Society, placed a wreath on the grave of Jonathan Hager, Founder.

The Society is now endeavoring to promote interest in preservation of the Founder's original home. This building, situated on unimproved land, adjoins the City Park.

The Society's most recent achievement was the naming of the aircraft carrier "U. S. S. Antietam." It is proposed that Washington County school-children present the dress colors; the Society present the date-plate, bearing, in addition to historical data, the inscription, "Washington County Historical Society, Donor."

Virginia Magazine—Our neighbor to the south and elder sister, the *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography*, with the issue for July, 1943, observed her fiftieth anniversary. The feature of the number is a catalog of the publications of the Virginia Historical Society since its founding in 1833, with a list of the contents of each volume of the Magazine from the first issue in 1894 to the present.

Banks Family—Should like to know something of the ancestry of Joshua Banks, who married a Richardson of Washington, D. C. He was probably connected with the Banks family who lived near Reisterstown, Md.

MRS. ROBERT R. HILL,
12 East 97th St., New York City.

Barrett—Can any one furnish the dates of Alexander Barrett's birth, marriage and death? He and his wife, Elizabeth, were living in Frederick County, Md., in 1753. His parents were Christian Henry and John Barrett, Jr. Grandparents were Ann and John Barrett; and Isabel and John Henry of Prince George's County, Md. Who were the parents of Ann Barrett? In her will, dated May 6, 1722, she leaves personalty to Ann Hill and to Mr. Clement Hill the residue of her estate. Who were the parents of Isabel Henry?

MRS. B. S. BURTON,
104 Georgia Ave., Valdosta, Ga.

Ogle Family—Mr. Thomas Ogle Clark, of Baltimore, writing in the *Baltimore Sun*, of January 1905, stated that the original Delaware Ogle, who was named Thomas, was a brother of Samuel Ogle, governor of Maryland, and came to America with the latter. In order to save other Ogle family searchers the trouble that this statement has caused the writer, a correction is herewith presented.

John Ogle, soldier of New Castle, was the original Ogle settler in Delaware, 1664. His wife was Elizabeth, and he had two sons, Thomas and John. His identity and that of his family is well authenticated by scores of records of New Castle County, also by other colonial records. Not long afterwards a Thomas Ogle settled in New Castle County. This Thomas had a son John, both of whom came "before the proprietary's arrival." John had a family of twelve children in 1701, as he so stated in a request for a land grant at the time. (*Penna. Arch.*, Ser. 2, Vol. XIX, p. 230).

As Governor Samuel Ogle's brother Thomas was baptised in 1713 (*Ogle and Bothal*, Ogle, New castle-upon-Tyne, A. Reid & Co., 1902, p. 214), obviously he was not the Thomas who settled in Delaware, "before the proprietary's arrival." The descendants of John, soldier of New Castle, thru his son Thomas, have been traced and verified with original records by the writer. Those thru his son John have been traced by Dr. S. S. Todd, an Ogle genealogist living in the early 1900's, but the writer has been unable to verify the Doctor's conclusions.

Thomas Ogle Clark also stated that several of Thomas Ogle's descendants were still living in Delaware at that time, viz.: Dr. Howard Ogle, Miss Virginia Ogle and Miss Julia Ogle, all of Wilmington; also Mrs. Maxwell Ocheltres of Chester, Pa., Mrs. Stephen J. Clark of Baltimore (mother of Thomas O. Clark). These are descended from Thomas Moore Ogle, sheriff of New Castle County, who was the son of Howard, son of Benjamin, son of Thomas. The father of Benjamin Ogle (b. 1756, d. 1828, married Hannah Simpson) was not Thomas who came from England in the middle 1700's but was the son of Thomas, grandson of John, the soldier of New Castle. The same error in ancestry occurs in *Historical & Biographical Encyclopedia of Delaware*, Wilmington, 1882, from which source Thomas Ogle Clark possibly derived his information.

The identical names of the family of John, soldier of New Castle, and the Thomas who settled in New Castle Co. later, have been a source of endless confusion to historians and genealogists dealing with the Ogles of Delaware. This information should be a step towards complete clarification. To completely disentangle the two families, it would be highly desirable to have a correct list of John's (son of John, soldier of New Castle) and a correct list of the twelve children of John, son of Thomas who settled in New Castle Co. "before the proprietary's arrival."

F. C. HIBBARD

P. O. Box 174, Barnesville, Ohio

Mr. William B. Marye, corresponding secretary of this Society, has contributed to the January-April issue of the *Pennsylvania Archaeologist* the first of two articles on Indian warriors' paths in the Pennsylvania-Maryland-Virginia region. The paper is the fruit of long and arduous study, both among records and in the field, and may be regarded as a definitive account of the two more westerly of the known routes to the south which were used by northern Indians. There is a map of the area between Old Town, Maryland, and Everitt, Pennsylvania, on the Juniata, which illustrates the course of a particular warriors' path.

CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS NUMBER

Editor of *The Sun*, Baltimore, HAMILTON OWENS is the author of *Baltimore on the Chesapeake*, a recent addition to the Seaports Series of Doubleday, Doran and Company. ☆ RAPHAEL SEMMES, a great-nephew of the Confederate admiral of the same name who commanded the *Alabama*, is a distinguished historian, best known for his *Captains and Mariners of Early Maryland* and *Crime and Punishment in Early Maryland*. ☆ By profession a teacher, First Lieutenant CHARLES B. CLARK, Ph. D. University of North Carolina, now of the U. S. Marine Corps, is on duty in the Pacific Theatre. ☆ WILLIAM D. HOYT, JR., a member of the staff of the Society, is a frequent contributor of papers on historical topics to this and other periodicals. ☆ With the present summary, DR. JOSEPH T. WHEELER brings to a conclusion the series which for the first time has thrown full light on the literary property and proclivities of colonial Marylanders. ☆ MRS. NANNIE BALL NIMMO, an occasional contributor to this and other magazines, is a genealogist of long experience. ☆ Corresponding secretary of the Society, WILLIAM B. MARYE is an authority on both the history and genealogy of Maryland.